

ORIGINAL

EPA OMBUDSMAN PUBLIC HEARING

BE IT REMEMBERED that upon the hearing

of the above-entitled matter held at the
 1 Unlontown United Methodist Church, 13370
 2 Cleveland Avenue, Uniontown, Ohio, and commencing
 3 on Monday the 25th day of January, 1999, at 7:15
 4 o'clock p.m., the following proceedings were had.

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION BY

BISH & ASSOCIATES, INC.

812 Key Building

Akron, Ohio 44308-1318

(330) 762-0031

(800) 332-0607

FAX: (330) 762-0300

E-Mail: stenos@raex.com

MR. MARTIN: We're now on the

record. Good evening. My name's Robert Martin,
 and I'm the national ombudsman for the
 Environmental Protection Agency for the Superfund
 program. I'm very glad to see all of you here
 tonight.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you use
 the mike, please?

MR. MARTIN: Sure. I didn't see it.

We'll start again. Good evening. My name's
 Robert Martin, I'm the national ombudsman for the
 United States Environmental Protection Agency, in
 particular for the Superfund program. I'm very
 pleased to see all of you here tonight. This is
 certainly a great turnout.

We're here to discuss the industrial
 excess landfill site, **which**, as you know, is
 located here in Uniontown, has been here for
 quite some time. I was **petitioned** by Christine
 Bore110 to initiate preliminary investigation for
 review of that site. And I am here in
 furtherance of that investigation to listen to
 you all and to gather more facts before making
 some preliminary recommendations to EPA Region 5
 in Chicago and to other EPA officials in

1 APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Environmental
 Protection Agency:

Robert J. Martin, EPA National Chnbudsman

Hugh B. Kaufman, Senior Engineer/,
 Principal Investigator
 Office of Solid and Emergency Response
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 Washington, D.C. 20460

On Behalf of the Lake Township Trustees:

Messrs. Kaufman & Cumberland
 CO., L.P.A.

By: Edda Sara Post, Attorney at Law
 1500 Republic Building
 25 Prospect Avenue, West
 Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1000

Page 2

1 Washington, D.C.

That being said I'd like to turn over
 for procedural matters the hearing at this
 juncture to Hugh Kaufman, who serves as my chief
 investigator. Hugh.

MR. KAUFMAN: Hi. I'm also a
 bureaucrat, and I'll use this microphone for a
 minute, but I talk pretty loud so I don't think
 I'll need it for the rest of the evening.

So just quickly, Bob's duties as
 ombudsman are, among other things, to make
 recommendations to the EPA as an independent
 entity, and the industrial **excess** landfill is a
 very big case that has tremendous ramifications
 to all of you, and as a result of the efforts of
 a number of your **citizens** and elected officials
 the Environmental Protection Agency has kept its
 distance and allowed Bob to do this independent
 look at the facility.

This public meeting is important to
 get broad feedback from, the community. It will
 not end tonight. The record will be open for
 everyone here if they want to provide written
 comments within the next couple of weeks
 subsequent to this. You can send them to Robert

Page 4

Page 5

1 Martin, mail stop 5101, U.S. EPA, Washington,
2 D.C., 20460.

3 On Bob's left, your right, is Edda
4 Post, who is an attorney for ~~the~~ Lake Township
5 trustees who are very much involved in getting to
6 the facts of this case, and we'd like to have as
7 many key government officials who are involved in
8 this process participate also.

9 In the audience from our Region 5
0 office in Chicago is our ~~comm~~ munity relations
1 supervisor for this site, Denise Gawlinski, and
2 for those of you who will follow what's going on,
3 EPA's Region 5 have proposed a change to the
4 remedy for that site and are holding a public
5 hearing on that the beginning of March. And
6 Denise has put a flyer describing that hearing at
7 the end of the table, so I wanted to sort of
8 alert you to that.

9 The purpose of this particular effort
0 on the part of Bob as the ombudsman is to take an
1 independent look at everything that has and is
2 being done at that site to help assure that the
3 public health and environment is being
4 protected.

5 Bob is a traditional ombudsman under

Page 6

1 the American Bar Association guidelines and
2 independent so that management of EPA does not
3 have any control of what he sees, what he
4 recommends.

5 The whole purpose of this effort is
6 to get, get to the truth get to ~~the~~ facts,
7 ultimately to assure that what is done does
8 protect the public health and environment from
9 serious problems.

0 I am -- I've been with the agency
1 forever, actually since the beginning. I was
2 chief investigator back in the '70s, and I
3 presently work for our assistant administrator as
4 principal investigator and senior engineer, and
5 he has asked me to help Bob on these cases as
6 chief investigator for Bob.

7 And I'm going to try to keep things
8 flowing here so that Bob can take in
9 information. Bob is ~~the~~ only ombudsman we've got
0 and he -- the most important thing is to get as
1 many facts to him so he can do his job.

2 With that end, there's a sign-up
3 sheet that a number of people have signed up for,
4 more can sign up. I'd like us to be done in two
5 hours, and I'd like as much information coming as

Page 7

1 possible so I'm not going to try to cut anybody
2 off, but I ~~would like~~ to d&l with facts.

3 This is not a popularity contest,
4 we're not counting heads to see how many people
5 are in favor of capping the site or pump and
6 treat. This is not a popularity contest, it's
7 merely trying to get to facts and information.

8 So with that, the first person who
9 signed up to speak is Don Myers, who's a trustee,
10 and I'm going to pass ~~the~~ microphone over here
11 because I think everyone will be able to hear me
12 when I talk. Don. Can everybody hear me?

13 AUDIENCE: Yes.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: Terrific.

15 MR. MYERS: Can everybody hear me?
16 Anybody can't hear me?

17 Okay. Don Myers. The Lake Township
18 trustees have been elected to help insure to ~~the~~
19 best of their ability ~~the~~ health and welfare of
20 its citizens, and we, we would like to go on
21 record with ~~the~~ following comments.

22 By the way, when you come up here
23 you're supposed to state your name, address,
24 spell your last name and position, if any. So
25 there's a prompter sheet here which I overlooked

Page 8

1 and made up myself. The last name is M-Y-E-R-S.

2 This community has lived under the
3 dark cloud of unanswered questions regarding IEL
4 for too many years. Since its designation as a
5 Superfund site over 15 years ago the site has, in
6 our opinion, been mishandled. No consideration
7 was given to the fact that it is located in the
8 middle of a growing town of approximately 9,000
9 who rely almost entirely on well water for all of
10 their needs, drinking, bathing, washing, cooking
11 and irrigation.

12 The recent turn of events whereby ~~the~~
13 EPA and the potential responsible parties have
14 proposed a change to change the final remedy to
15 mere reliance on nature to clean up the site is
16 quite disturbing.

17 In July of 1995, just ~~three~~ and a
18 half years ago, ~~the~~ EPA determined that after
19 reviewing all the previous data that the pump and
20 treat process was necessary and that the one to
21 two foot distance between the water table and the
22 contaminants posed a distinct problem.
23 Apparently this is no longer an issue. What
24 happens if we have an abundant rainfall that
25 raises the water table a foot?

Page 13

1 community will be sufficiently flimflammed by
2 their rhetoric and agree with them or at a
3 minimum silently accept the back-alley deals
4 because we, the community, do not have the
5 monetary and other resources to challenge them?
6 We hope not.

7 We hope that the EPA will meet their
8 statutory obligations to thoroughly investigate
9 the site and ensure that the remedy adopted for
10 IEL will protect the health and safety of those
11 of us who have to live with the decaying remains
12 in our back yards forever. We are not convinced
13 that this is what is happening now.

14 We ask that Mr. Martin complete a
15 full investigation so we, the citizens of Lake
16 Township, can have faith that a proper resolution
17 to this most serious and disturbing problem is at
18 hand and that our health and safety and the
19 health and safety of our children and
20 grandchildren is preserved. Thank you.

21 MR. KAUFMAN: Don, could I ask you a
22 couple of questions because I think you've raised
23 some important issues?

24 One of your concerns, if I understood
25 you correctly, is that without the 1998

Page 14

1 groundwater data in hand you feel ill-equipped to
2 fully respond to the proposal to change the
3 remedy, is that one of your big concerns?

4 MR. MYERS: This statement is
5 prepared by the trustees.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Right.

7 MR. MYERS: And as one of the
8 trustees I do not have an answer to that question
9 because Sue Ruley actually is the one that's been
10 more or less handling this.

11 MR. KAUFMAN: I understand.

12 MR. MYERS: And I think you
13 understand the situation why Sue is not here.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: Right. And this is her
15 church.

16 MR. MYERS: I would like to refer
17 this question to Chris Bomllo. Would you ask
18 her that when she comes to the --

19 MR. KAUFMAN: Sure, absolutely. But
20 then the final question, Don, is it your sense
21 that the trustees are uncomfortable with how
22 Region 5 of EPA and EPA have handled this case up
23 until now?

24 MR. MYERS: I think that would be a
25 correct assessment.

Page 15

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Good. Thank you
2 very much. I appreciate your statement on behalf
3 of the trustees.

4 The next person is James Titmas. Am
5 I reading it correctly? Mr. Titmas.

6 MR. TITMAS: Correct.

7 MR. KAUFMAN: Oh, boy, I'm batting a
8 thousand. James, thank you very much for coming
9 and providing information for us.

10 MR. TITMAS: Thank you. My name is
11 James Titmas, I live at 3577 Yellow Creek Road in
12 Bath, Ohio, and it may seem -- oh, Titmas,
13 T-I-T-M-A-S.

14 My position in this case really goes
15 back to the '70s when I was an engineering
16 consultant to Hyman Budoff. We together were
17 trying to get approval for an incinerator to
18 destroy the wastes that were coming from my
19 clients, which by coincidence happened to be all
20 the principal responsible parties in this case.

21 I've been practicing in waste water
22 treatment engineering now for just a little over
23 42 years. At the time that the method of
24 destroying these wastes were turned down I kind
25 of made it a life mission to find out what would

Page 16

1 happen to the wastes if they weren't destroyed,
2 and since then I've been following and tracking
3 what has happened at the industrial excess
4 landfill because that's where the wastes went,
5 Just because the agencies and people in authority
6 turned down the method to destroy the waste, that
7 did not mean that the waste went away.

8 I have a few -- I really have a lot
9 of questions, but I have listed them and I would
10 like the list to be made part of the record, and
11 I'll provide it to you when I'm done after a few
12 moments here. Associated questions can be
13 presented briefly, which would give others a
14 chance to participate, and I'll have -- answer
15 any questions you might have when I'm complete
16 here.

17 The fundamental problem appears to
18 include a massive underestimation of the
19 industrial excess landfill by the Environmental
20 Protection Agency. This began on day one and
21 continues today. Without adequate core sampling
22 there has never been a complete assessment of the
23 amounts and kinds of waste that are in inventory,
24 how many pounds of benzene? How many pounds of
25 phthalates? How many pounds of aluminum chloride

Page 17

1 and so forth and so forth?

2 We have the list and we know how much
3 and what type of waste these industries produce,
4 and we should anticipate that they will be in
5 inventory. Oddly some of them weren't even
6 tested for. Without identifying the true
7 groundwater background there's been no
8 comprehensive evaluation of the limits of the
9 contaminated underground water. EPA relied on
10 two wells that had a salt content of 200
11 milligrams per liter. The industrial excess
12 landfill is located in the terminal marine of a
13 glacier and as these waters leach the soils and
14 gravels they flush all of the salts out of the
15 soil.

16 In my experience, after testing
17 hundreds of wells, the true background should be
18 about 25 milligrams per liter, not 200, so that
19 the representative background wells were clearly
20 within the influence of the IEL and were not
21 background, and the background, the true
22 background may be as far as a mile away. These
23 gravels have measured porosity as high as three
24 feet per hour. These are open washed gravels
25 that are down below this site, and it's not going

Page 18

1 to keep the waste close to the property by any
2 means.

3 Without a containing cap over the IEL
4 there's been no measurement of the amount and
5 types of gas emerging from the landfill or, by
6 the way, moving laterally under a frozen
7 surface. For the last month or so we've had a
8 thick snow cover with frozen ground below, that
9 is, in effect, identical to a circular cap and
10 can cause gas to migrate great distances from a
11 landfill.

12 Akron had a bad incident at Hardy
13 Road where houses a half mile from that landfill
14 has gases accumulate in the basement and explode,
15 and it was under the same conditions as the
16 frozen ground.

17 Now, there's a gas collection system
18 out there. It's apparently not in very good
19 repair, but it can't collect gas if it's going
20 through sand. I know the contractor that put the
21 cover over that landfill, and all he was given to
22 work with was sand. So not only does the sand
23 let the gas out, it lets rainwater in and causes
24 or creates the conditions whereby the waste that
25 are in the landfill can migrate into the

Page 19

1 aquifer.

2 These critical shortcomings beg the
3 following questions: How can the EPA determine
4 what the federal government's share of the
5 cleanup will be if the EPA refuses to test for
6 government waste? And quite frankly, that will
7 include both low-level and transuranic
8 radioactive waste. Those are both being used by
9 local government agencies, and if they're
10 handling them we can be virtually certain that
11 somehow that they will be in that waste stream.
12 If that is documented it may actually turn out
13 that the largest single principal responsible
14 party by far may be the federal government,
15 larger than all our local industries together.

16 How can EPA report to congress the
17 total cost of the IEL cleanup if it does not know
18 how much of what kinds of wastes are involved or
19 where the wastes have gone? Somehow the EPA has
20 established a budget of what they're going to do
21 and how they're going to do it. Incidentally,
22 the pump and treat included a process called air
23 stripping, which is a process where you spray
24 water into the air and let the contaminants go in
25 the atmosphere and attempt to clean the water.

Page 20

1 One of the reasons that's been set aside is the
2 record of decision is the National Science
3 Foundation has turned thumbs down on the process
4 in its principal in concept.

5 I for one thank God that they've
6 abandoned air stripping as a process to clean up
7 the IEL, it never should have been there in the
8 first place. Getting rid of the waste, yes, that
9 would be good, but spraying them in the air would
10 be a foolish mistake.

11 How can EPA claim there are no health
12 risks if it does not know how much of what wastes
13 are involved or where have they gone? How can
14 EPA claim waste are self-attenuating when the
15 obvious and simple explanation for the change in
16 the token test results was that the underground
17 water waste simply migrated from the test
18 location? Between over two year or -- one to two
19 year period the assumption was that whatever
20 wastes were there would stay right in that spot.
21 Well, with no cap over the landfill and so many
22 people living in the area depending on water
23 wells the groundwater will be moving, and what
24 simply happened was that particular lens of waste
25 simply moved off-site away from the test well and

1 something else came in its place, in this case
 2 benzene.
 3 But that's **the** nature of an
 4 industrial landfill, one week it gets aluminum
 5 chloride waste and solution from making synthetic
 6 rubber, two weeks later they get a big batch of
 7 phthalates from **the** making of vinyl, a few weeks
 8 later they'll get a big batch of benzene from
 9 somebody trying to clean up a raw product that
 0 was intended to make rubber or something like
 1 that.

2 What goes to the landfill are
 3 off-specification materials, materials where they
 4 were trying to make one product and somebody
 5 goofed and they made something else and **they** got
 6 to put it in a tank truck and get rid of it
 7 before **the** supervisor gets **back**. That's a
 8 simplification but that's the kind of thing that
 9 **you're facing**. So that you're not going to find
 0 any specific pure chemicals in there but you'll
 1 find this hodgepodge of debris.

2 When a raw gallon or two tank loads
 3 of benzene come to a **plant**, it's not pure enough
 4 to use in the process so they have to clean the
 5 contaminants out of the benzene, and when **they**

1 have this batch of contaminants they've got to
 2 get rid of it and it will go to **IEL**, or probably
 3 will. They weren't allowed to burn it.

4 I was also wondering philosophically
 5 how much of a share of **the final** cleanup will the
 6 **EPA** accept due to the **EPA's** delays in finding the
 7 true facts and ultimate final solution for **the**
 8 **IEL**? **There** always seem to be enough time and
 9 money to do it over but never enough time and
 0 money to do it right. Why should our local
 1 industries that are still in business be made to
 2 carry the federal share of this cleanup or pay
 3 the sheriff corporations who's bankruptcy has
 4 been approved by the federal government thus
 5 excusing the liabilities of such companies?

6 There's been no clear presentation of
 7 how the **EPA** decided what the principal party --
 8 responsible party should pay. As a result they
 9 rebelled because **there** isn't a clear plan. It
 0 seems to me that it's strictly an arbitrary and
 1 capricious method whereby the **EPA** says you, you
 2 and you will pay because you're the only ones
 3 left with money, but they don't identify how much
 4 they were and that hurts our community,
 5 especially if it's not the correct identification --

1 of how the costs should be.

2 Finally, there are about 70,000 known
 3 man-made chemicals, but the **IEL** contains the
 4 debris from off-specification production, the
 5 waste from cleaning raw materials and the waste
 6 from product refinement but **EPA** keeps testing for
 7 very limited number of chemicals. **The** question
 8 is what system does the **EPA** use to decide that it
 9 will not test for a suspected and probable
 0 waste?

1 And that concludes my direct
 2 questions, and I have a written handout for you
 3 all.

4 **MR. KAUFMAN:** James, thank you very
 5 much. I have a couple of questions. I think you
 6 raised some very important points.

7 Maybe you could put some -- when you
 8 leave, Mr. Titmas, put some at the end so folks
 9 who haven't gotten copies might be able to get
 0 some.

1 **MR. TITMAS:** Thank you. **There** are
 2 only a few, but I'll provide whatever is
 3 available.

4 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Okay. Great. A couple
 5 of questions. Number one, you're a geologist?

1 **MR. TITMAS:** No, I'm a professional
 2 engineer practicing in industrial waste
 3 treatment.

4 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Terrific. Well, I'm
 5 glad you're in the field, and I'm glad we have
 6 **you** here to help us as an expert.

7 Do you feel it's appropriate or
 8 possible for you as a citizen to comment
 9 adequately on a change in the remedy without
 0 looking at the most recent groundwater data
 1 that's **been** developed at the **IEL** site?

2 **MR. TITMAS:** I have several problems
 3 with self-attenuation, they're fundamental. If
 4 the waste are digesting themselves with the aid
 5 of bacteria, that bacteria should be in evidence
 6 with the waste. No such tests or identification
 7 was made. They have not identified a particular
 8 biota that's responsible. They did not even
 9 identify whether it was aerobic or anaerobic in
 0 nature. They did not identify whether it was
 1 present in sufficient quantities to digest the
 2 waste down to the remarkable endpoint that
 3 **existed**.

4 Normally when a biomass will digest
 5 an organic, and that will happen, it stops

Page 25

Page 27

1 functioning as it runs out of food and that may
2 be as high as three or 4,000 micrograms per
3 liter, in other words, at a level well above the
4 lower reading.

5 Also, groundwater temperature's in
6 the order of 55 degrees, and you have to have
7 very ideal pH conditions and you have to have
8 very carefully sustained conditions to maintain a
9 special bacteria that digests a specific waste
10 such as a phthalate or a benzene. That evidence,
11 that backup material was simply absent, and it
12 appears that their basis or assumption of
13 self-attenuation was a desired or self-fulfilling
14 wish. That's been consistent with my discussions
15 with the EPA is that they like to avoid anything
16 that may contradict their conclusions.

17 MR. KAUFMAN: So it's your feeling, I
18 don't mean to put words in your mouth, as an
19 expert that you don't really feel there's enough
20 data that you've seen to draw the kind of
21 technical conclusion that they've drawn?

22 MR. TITMAS: I agree with that. My
23 conclusions specifically in this case was given
24 the data that they presented as their finding, I
25 can only conclude that that particular event of

Page 26

1 groundwater pollution has simply moved on to
2 another location and has been replaced with water
3 that's been flushed through the landfill and now
4 they have another contaminant, and that is the
5 nature of an industrial landfill.

6 You'll have these successive waves of
7 different materials that reflect the event of
8 when they were added and when they were flushed.

9 MR. KAUFMAN: And it was also your
10 statement, I believe, that the wells, the two
11 wells being used as background, are really
12 impacted by the materials in the landfill. And
13 am I correct in assuming that that means any
14 conclusion about what is coming from the landfill
15 is inaccurate because the background wells are
16 technically in the wrong place?

17 MR. TITMAS: The problem is a little
18 more complex than that.

19 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

20 MR. TITMAS: In our local wells, I've
21 measured wells that have been contaminated by
22 salt water storage for the highway department, I
23 have found wells that have radon in them,
24 background, natural background radioactivity or a
25 naturally occurring radioactive material.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Right.

2 MR. TITMAS: We also have found wells
3 that I've measured and tested that have as high
4 as 90 milligrams per liter of chemical oxygen
5 demand, which is due primarily to natural oils
6 coming up from the deep strata up through the
7 fractured rock and up to the surface. So sorting
8 out what is specifically IEL, sorting out what is
9 natural is a pretty tough problem, but they are
10 so far off in their assumption in this case that
11 a chloride count that is fully eight times to ten
12 times the normal background, that it's been an
13 absolute blunder. The minimum number of wells
14 that they should test is probably a thousand
15 wells, and they should probably test every well
16 within a mile of the boarder of the industrial
17 excess landfill.

18 MR. KAUFMAN: Every drinking water
19 well within a mile?

20 MR. TITMAS: Every well, every
21 groundwater source that they can find because
22 without that they won't actually visualize or
23 won't actually reproduce this event rising of the
24 leading edge of these various plumes. There will
25 be a plume leading edge for benzene, there will

Page 28

1 be one for chlorides, there will be one for
2 phthalates, there will be one for all these other
3 materials that are routinely handled in our local
4 industries and government agencies, and those
5 need to be identified and clearly shown. They
6 haven't done that, haven't done anywhere near
7 their homework.

8 MR. KAUFMAN: One final question, you
9 mention government waste as potentially a major
10 contributor to the environmental and public
11 health risks posed by the IEL landfill. I assume
12 you're talking about, among other things,
13 radioactivity?

14 MR. TITMAS: Yes, low-level waste.
15 We have five major Department of Energy
16 facilities in Ohio, some of them are fairly
17 remote, but they all have problems and especially
18 getting rid of materials. Like a
19 trichlorethylene or a dry cleaning fluid that has
20 been used to clean materials of radioactive
21 contamination and it would come in a barrel,
22 something like this, a 55-gallon drum, and they
23 had to get rid of them.

24 There's no possibility even though
25 Piketon tried to get a permit, the State of Ohio

Page 29

1 doesn't issue such permits to bum radioactive
2 material. They can't **store** it **so** essentially
3 what happens, it goes to a landfill. They could
4 **identify** several, for instance, that have no EPA
5 supervision at all. When there's a charge made
6 per ton of taking something to a landfill, no
7 moneys are set aside to monitor that well to see
8 that that landfill -- to make sure that it
9 complies or evaluate the impact on the local
10 community, so it's out of sight out of mind, **ship**
11 it.

2 MR. KAUFMAN: Well, let me ask a
3 question with regards to that then. Are you
4 familiar or aware of any borings or soil analysis
5 done by EPA where they **look** for radioactive
6 materials that they didn't find it?

7 MR. TITMAS: Well, I had seen some
8 reports of **the IEL**, the problem is one of
9 identifying background again, what does one
10 accept for background. **Bawd on my own** personal
11 knowledge of what I knew was being produced and
12 handled and what my **own clients** were working
13 **with**, there's greater than a 99 percent
14 **probability** that low-level wastes are in storage
15 at **the IEL**.

Page 30

1 **They're** almost certainly there. The
2 reason the EPA hasn't found any is they haven't
3 done any core samples of any significant note on
4 the site itself. They haven't gone down. They
5 told **me the** reason **they** couldn't do core samples
6 on the site itself, because they were afraid it
7 would catch fire or they would penetrate a drum.
8 Well, if they penetrate a drum and test from that
9 drum some radioactive materials, their next
10 official act is to dig it up and take it
11 someplace else.

2 MR. KAUFMAN: As an expert, do you
3 think that statement is valid technically as an
4 expert in this field?

5 MR. TITMAS: That **there** are those
6 wastes present?

7 MR. KAUFMAN: No, that it's not safe
8 to core into the site.

9 MR. TITMAS: It's -- that's
10 ridiculous, it's perfectly safe to core. We have
11 many things at our disposal to accomplish a
12 remedy in the event there's a problem. In the
13 public districts it's far more important to **know**
14 what is there than to sit back and say, Oh, I
15 don't want to do a core sample because we might

Page 31

1 have a problem. I think they didn't want -- and
2 this is putting words in their mouth, I think
3 they didn't want to test because **they** didn't want
4 to find it.

5 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much,
6 Mr. Titmas. I appreciate your expert testimony.

7 The next individual is Chris Borello,
8 who has over the years done what I believe is an
9 outstanding job in keeping up with all of the
10 issues here and bringing it to everybody's light
11 **so** that the public's interest will **be** served, and
12 I'd like to thank you for that as a government
13 official, Ms. Borello, and please go forward.

14 MS. BORELLO: My name is Christine
15 Borello, 28 16 Bridlewood Street, Northwest, North
16 Canton.

17 My position is I've been the
18 spokesperson/president of Concerned Citizens of
19 Lake Township **for 15** and a half years.

20 MR. KAUFMAN: Just hold it closer to
21 your mouth.

22 MS. BORELLO: Is this okay? I've
23 been the **president/spokesperson for Concerned**
24 citizens of Lake Township. I'm involved with the
25 **IEL for 15 and a half years**. I want to thank

Page 32

1 you, **Mr. Martin**, Mr. Kaufman, publicly for coming
2 to Uniontown today to view our Superfund site
3 firsthand. We gave them a tour this afternoon of
4 the site and to see some of the neighborhoods and
5 also for this meeting tonight.

6 As you well know, it is our sincere
7 hope that you will decide to continue on with
8 your, investigation of IEL. **We** strongly believe
9 that there is a tremendous amount of evidence
10 that warrants this further in-depth
11 investigation, and we only hope that you have all
12 the tools financially and authoritative-wise,
13 power-wise that you will need administratively at
14 your immediate disposal if this is your decision
15 to continue on so that no additional & lays
16 occur.

17 While it is frequently stated that
18 **our** group, CCLT, has been fighting for the truth
19 at IEL for over 15 years, in reality this battle
20 began with townspeople back in the mid '60s **when**
21 people like Milly Griffith and **her** family took
22 the landfill owner, Hyman **Budoff**, to task.

23 And I want to take a moment to tell
24 you that Milly is 8 1 years old and she
25 desperately wanted to be here tonight. She is **at**

Page 33

1 Aultman Hospital. I ask for your prayers, she is
 2 not doing very well. **She** cried this morning, she
 3 wanted so much to meet Mr. Martin and to be
 4 **here**.
 5 She lived in the community since 1954
 6 on the edge of the dump and was one of our
 7 evacuees, her home was purchased. She had the
 8 vinyl chloride in her well and it was one of **the**
 9 key wells that provided ultimate water to the
 10 other homes based on her findings. She had
 1 explosive gases in her home and had to live for
 2 years with a methane mine alarm in her basement
 3 that they would live with their car keys on their
 4 night stands and when the alarms would go off,
 5 and they would go off frequently, **they** had to
 6 immediately evacuate their homes, and this is the
 7 hell they lived in for approximately four and a
 8 half years until the. **EPA** finally decided, thanks
 9 to Mark **Bashor**, head of risk assessment at **ATSDR**,
 10 to go a step beyond and stood up to **EPA** and
 1 demanded that they be evacuated into hotel
 2 rooms.
 3 Also People like **Larry Prince**, who
 4 will speak later in the evening. When I was
 5 still in high school, no offense, Larry, he

Page 34

1 started round one in the late '60s, early 1970s,
 2 lived on the edge of the dump on the north end on
 3 Amber Circle, and he will tell you a little bit
 4 about his story. These people bravely fought
 5 this dump while the polluters were actively
 6 dumping in the '60s and '70s, from '66 to '78.
 7 They fought the good fight before **there** was even
 8 a Superfund program, state or federal. **They**
 9 wrote letters to the editor and collected over
 10 900 signatures on a petition and when it was just
 1 a little Amish/Mennonite farming community
 2 demanding this dump be shut down because of what
 3 they saw, all the barrels and tankers coming at
 4 night. Nevertheless, they knew it was **&ad** wrong
 5 to be dumping the large volumes of liquid
 6 chemicals directly onto the ground in what was a
 7 former sand and gravel pit.
 8 Indeed it ultimately was **admitted** in
 9 a 1971 memorandum at the local health department
 10 that up to 11,000 gallons a day of liquid
 1 chemicals were being dumped into the **IEL**, and the
 2 state **EPA** admitted when they submitted us to
 3 Superfund, because you'll hear the low ball now
 4 there's nothing left in there, they admitted that
 5 the site contains, and this is a **direct** quote

Page 35

1 when they submitted to Superfund in 1983 or '84,
 2 greater than 780,000 tons of, quote, hazardous
 3 substances making this site **over** a period of time
 4 larger than the infamous Love Canal, and they had
 5 city water to begin with.
 6 Unfortunately from the 1960s on to
 7 the present date this community has been met with
 8 incredible, very highly unusual I'm told,
 9 opposition at every turn in our effort to obtain
 10 the truth about what was done to this site and
 11 our attempts to hold the **EPA** accountable for its
 12 work that it has performed here.
 13 **When** my group **started** round two after
 14 Larry and Milly and the others fought round one,
 15 I began this in August of 1983, we were told the
 16 burden of proof was on our citizens. They said
 17 we had no proof, we would never get any proof and
 18 we would never get monitoring wells and we would
 19 never make Superfund. Well, we obviously proved
 20 this one **local** official wrong, we went on to
 21 fight and get on to Superfund and ranked fourth
 22 out of 244 sites in 1984 including the military
 23 installations.
 24 But, the fight for **j ustice** and truth
 25 has been an ongoing nightmare that seems will

Page 36

1 never end. We were warned repeatedly it was just
 2 too big, the opposition was just too powerful,
 3 that we could never win, and they said absolutely
 4 truth cannot **come** out here. However, despite
 5 these incredible odds we cannot -- I personally
 6 cannot walk away, although many times I wanted
 7 to, because we knew the health and welfare of the
 8 citizens is at stake and that's our sole
 9 motivating force. behind this, the kids, the
 10 people, the. families, the friends and neighbors.
 11 How many deaths have occurred as a
 12 result of exposure to toxi as coming from **IEL**
 13 **through the** water, soils and gases I'm **sure** we'll
 14 never know. But while we can do nothing about
 15 the past there is much that can be done to
 16 prevent future illness and **defects** in the
 17 children in the future.
 18 It is totally inexcusable that **EPA**
 19 has failed to monitor this site on an ongoing
 20 basis. The last time they **sampled** for chemicals
 21 or radiation, except for a few split samples to
 22 check up on the **companics** this past September,
 23 they allowed -- since **March** of '93 they did
 24 nothing to this site, they **allowed** the stuff to
 25 continue to flow out. **They** knew, again, 780,000

page 37

1 tons purchased sand and gravel pit and they knew
 2 the rate of flow was up to six feet a day and
 3 they did nothing to monitor for five years. They
 4 just -- they just walked out of **here** and then
 5 they began their behind-closed-doors negotiations
 5 in federal court with **the PRPs**, and you've heard
 7 about the results of their behind-closed-door
 3 dealings.

3 It is also disgusting to hear that
 3 **EPA** attempts to hide behind and mislead officials
 1 in attempts to putting **their spin** out timely and
 2 saying the real problem with Uniontown lies with
 3 poor communications. **They** want to write this
 4 whole thing off. If they had **PRed** you folks
 5 better **there** would be no problem here, **the**
 6 problem would have been taken care of. Of
 7 course, this **couldn't** be further from **the** truth
 8 and they know that, it's not the truth.

9 **The fact is we all understand too**
 0 **well** what went on **here**. We've done our homework
 1 **over the last 15 years and have survived eight**
 2 different project **managers from** the federal EPA
 3 and nearly as many from the state. **Their** obvious
 4 **goal is to discredit me and my group and trustees**
 5 **and any other people including high-level**

Page 38

1 officials.

2 **I'm in very good company with some of**
 3 these people like Thomas **Grumbly**, former head of
 4 Nuclear Waste **Disposal** at DOE, president of Clean
 5 Sites, they've done **their** best to **discredit** all
 6 of us because **they** fear someday someone might
 7 listen to us. Well, Mr. Martin, you have heard
 8 us, thank **God**, and you behaved in citizens, and
 9 **we are very grateful that you are here.**

0 **The facts** and details at times appear
 1 **to be complex and confusing and I hear this over**
 2 and over again, You're losing me, Chris, this is
 3 too complex, too complicated. Well, that's true
 4 on one hand. We've **recognized a** distinct pattern
 5 that has evolved over a period of time and in
 6 indeed now it seems in retrospect too simple to
 7 pinpoint what has happened at IEL.

8 As we inherently knew then in the
 9 midst of each and every battle, and there were
 0 hundreds of battles, we fought on every scrap of
 1 piece of data, we've had to claw and scratch for
 2 every single piece of information. We realize
 3 now that simple -- plain and simple a matter of
 4 evidence or lack of evidence

5 When we fought year after year for

Page 39

1 things like core samples we knew that without
 2 cores being done some fatally flawed plan could
 3 develop just like now, the plan you're all
 4 hearing about, this wonderful plan of letting
 5 Mother Nature take care of it, let natural
 6 attenuation take place now **being** promoted by **the**
 7 EPA and PR man that they have hired by the
 8 **polluters.**

9 Of course, the most glaring example
 0 of this town being deprived of crucial evidence
 1 is when high levels of radiation were thrown out
 2 in 1991. **It is important to note that these high**
 3 levels were found five years after we had begun
 4 asking for such tests to be done. The
 5 **appropriate time to do these tests were during**
 6 **the period called remedial investigation which**
 7 **began in 1985 and it ended in July of 1989 when**
 8 **they signed our record of decision or our ROD.**

9 **Instead of doing these tests at the appropriate**
 0 **time period we begged, we pleaded, we wrote**
 1 **letters, we lobbied the Congressmen and Senators,**
 2 **they refused.** It was quite strange that they
 3 **refused because we had old-timers like Milly and**
 4 **her family that saw, witnessed the nuclear**
 5 samples coming in nightly for two solid years in

Page 40

1 **1969 and 1979 -- excuse me, 1969 and '70 at the**
 2 **height** of the Vietnam War, and **they** wouldn't do
 3 **the** testing during the appropriate time period.

4 **I always have to laugh when I hear**
 5 that the EPA has blamed citizens and our group
 6 for these delays. Oh, we would have cleaned the
 7 site up a long time ago if Chris **Borello** and
 8 **their** stupid group would have kept **their** mouth
 9 shut. **The problem is we couldn't keep our mouths**
 0 shut because we knew too much, and we **couldn't**
 1 **sit by and watch a cleanup take place that we**
 2 **knew** from what we had studied and had done **our**
 3 homework could inadvertently **cause** the spread of
 4 **pollution further down the stream laterally,** and
 5 even if you gave the whole town alternate water
 6 **we are very** much concerned about the gas issues
 7 and **there** are studies that have totally
 8 vindicated us on that subject.

9 In any event, had the data stood in
 0 1991, I'm referring to the high levels of
 1 radiation, and you hear about the companies going
 2 **in** now, and they've done a round or two, and they
 3 get to go into federal court and **they** get to
 4 **determine our** lives tossing out virtually about a
 5 decade's worth of testing, right? They get to go

Page 41

1 in with **the** contractor **they** hired and now they
 2 get to reopen the **rod** behind closed doors. Well,
 3 I contend had that data stood -- and that's why
 4 we asked Mr. Martin to investigate this radiation
 5 issue because had that data stood, **the** levels of
 6 radiation found **there** were well above regulatory
 7 concern limits, and that's a key buzz word,
 8 regulatory concern limits, it's a legal
 9 terminology and it's all important.

0 We firmly believe had that data stood
 1 almost nine years ago they would have reopened
 2 **our** **rod**. **our** 1989 **rod**, and we would have -- we
 3 believe a cleanup could have begun or at least we
 4 could have really been further ahead than eight
 5 years ago, but instead they threw the data out,
 6 **they** smeared the commercial laboratory, couple
 7 labs, and then threw one thing after another to
 8 blur and confuse the issues, although Ohio **EPA**
 9 did do further radiation testing and they did
 0 find radiation in the groundwater and it was
 1 above background according to our experts. Dr.
 2 Marvin Resnikoff, who would have liked to have
 3 **been** **here** tonight but **could** not be, he claimed
 4 some radiation rates **were** 140 times over
 5 background.

Page 42

1 Of **course**, while **the** **EPA** has denied
 2 **the** citizens the evidence that **we** needed to
 3 **reopen** **our** **rod** **the** -- and the government played
 4 **the** regulatory **concern** game, the state and
 5 federal **EPA** have now **turned** and caved into the
 6 **wishes** of polluters undoing over nine years worth
 7 of testing that they did do there. They didn't
 8 do **the** best testing in **the** world, but what they
 9 did do there they are throwing out by accepting
 0 **the** evidence of **the** polluters based on **their** one
 1 or two rounds of testing. What is wrong with
 2 this picture?

3 And in closing, while **EPA** has
 4 repeatedly attempted to dismiss its citizens'
 5 concerns **here** by saying it's just a handful of
 6 troublemakers, they know it is not **the** truth.
 7 Indeed, **there** have **been** many officials and other
 8 government agencies that have tried to help us
 9 including the Department of Energy and the
 0 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and **ATSDR**.

1 **EPA** likewise has ignored **the** advice
 2 of **our** **TAG** experts. Our group was the first
 3 group in **the** country mandated by Congress, and we
 4 received a total of a hundred thousand dollars.
 5 We hired some of the nation's best experts, as I

Page 43

1 just mentioned, Dr. Resnikoff, Dr. Cole and
 2 others, and they said many of the things Mr.
 3 Titmas stood here, you know, ten **years** ago they
 4 said it and **EPA** blew them off. **The** bottom line
 5 is anyone who dared to challenge U.S. **EPA** to hold
 6 them accountable has been dismissed or blown
 7 off.

8 Thanks to Dave Herbert and the local
 9 trustees, **they** did what's called a freedom of
 10 information **act** or request, and **they** contacted
 11 **through** this program a **paper** trail, and **we**
 12 haven't **read** about it in the papers yet, I hope
 13 we will, but a letter **that** the township received,
 14 their attorney, was that **EPA** solicited two of
 15 their own technical people in Ada, Oklahoma, Dr.
 16 Mary Randolph and a subcontractor who worked for
 17 **them**, an opinion on this attenuation idea. And
 18 **this** paper trail begins in like '97, it continues
 19 on to March **6th**, 1998, and what they learned in
 20 **this** paper trail was that when Dr. Randolph was
 21 consulted, again, she was solicited by Region 5
 22 for an opinion on what the companies were
 23 proposing to do there, she responded in a **letter**
 24 that she had a **multitude of concerns** and
 25 recommended five more rounds of testing and said

Page 44

1 that the levels of certain **chemicals** were
 2 increasing, not decreasing, but -- so they didn't
 3 like what Dr. Randolph said so they won't let the
 4 Canton Repository now talk to her.
 5 Again, I **state** that anyone who has
 6 disagreed with Region 5 or U.S. **EPA** is dismissed
 7 or discredited, therefore, it comes down to this
 8 question that I ask Robert Martin and others, is
 9 U.S. **EPA** and our state **EPA**, because they're
 10 concurring with this lousy plan, are they above
 11 **the** law and can they be held accountable for
 12 their actions?

13 We suspect that **maybe** some laws have
 14 been broken **here** at this site if an in-depth
 15 investigation is done. We hope that this
 16 investigation will enable us to hold **EPA**
 17 accountable because if **they** can get away with
 18 what was done at Uniontown they can do this
 19 anywhere in **the** country **and** that will be a
 20 tragedy for everyone in this country.

21 I want to say God bless you, Mr.
 22 Martin, for coming here, and I hope that God will
 23 **be** with you in the days to **come** because you
 24 really are our last hope. This community and a
 25 lot of -- the **health** and welfare of a lot of

Page 45

1 people **we** strongly believe **is** at stake **here** so
 2 thank you very much.
 3 MR. KAUFMAN: I **have** one question,
 4 Ms. Borello. I've noticed you've sort of been
 5 the citizen expert reading every piece of paper,
 6 all the data. Have you seen any test borings in
 7 soil **done** either by EPA or **the** state
 8 Environmental Agency that did not show plutonium
 9 and/or other radionuclides **in** it when they looked
 0 for it?

1 MS. BORELLO: No, every time that **we**
 2 -- a boring we saw they came up with radiation.

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Every time, plutonium
 4 or **other** radionuclides based on all **the** data
 5 you've seen?

6 MS. BORELLO: A boring, right. Not
 7 the core samples. When **they** bored into the
 8 landfill and we saw the data when they looked for
 9 radiation, every **time they** looked we believe they
 0 found radiation.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: And that's based on
 2 reading all of **the** data?

3 MS. BORELLO: correct.

4 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. BORELLO: **And I also have a list**

Page 46

1 **that** is a handout but to give **the** audience and
 2 everyone an idea of the **seriousness** Of the
 3 questions that we have uncovered through **our** 15
 4 and a half years worth of work, and I know it's
 5 overwhelming but it's just kind of--just to
 6 illustrate, it's not one or two concerns that we
 7 have, there's just a **multitude** of them. And **our**
 8 concerns are not limited to this list either, but
 9 I'd like to submit those as well.

0 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much,
 1 Ms. Borello.

2 Kathy **Magel**. Did I pronounce it
 3 correctly, Miss **Magel**?

4 MS. MAGEL: Yes.

5 MR. KAUFMAN: Good.

6 MS. MAGEL: My name is Kathy **Magel**,
 7 M-A-G-E-L, my address is 1025 East Maple, North
 8 Canton.

9 Mr. Martin, Mr. Kaufman, I'm **here** to
 0 relate a **letter** that although is remote of CCLT
 1 it appears it may have some significance.

2 For background information, **after**
 3 newspaper articles of a Uniontown dump of the
 4 **Tuscarawas** River being full of contaminated fish
 5 I realize my residence of North Canton **was** in the

Page 47

1 middle.

2 I contacted Miss Borello as a fellow
 3 band parent and inquired about specific
 4 information of which chemicals were suspect and
 5 at what levels. She provided an abundance of
 6 information.

7 My family drove the material to the
 8 very man who had a hand in **the** making of **these**
 9 man-made plutonium isotopes, my father-in-law,
 10 Dr. Theodore **Magel**. For proof I offer you this
 11 publication from the Los **Alamos** Science at which
 12 he and his partner are featured on **the cover** and
 13 inside describe what, **50** pages or more a detailed
 14 account of their pioneer work on plutonium,
 15 (indicating). You may have a copy of any part or
 16 all parts of that publication.

17 Dr. **Magel** upon inspection of the CEP
 18 **report** was alarmed that this particular mix of
 19 chemicals lead to nuclear waste, and he would
 20 know, and **he demanded** to know why EPA disavowed
 21 CEP's results. Independently of CCLT I contacted
 22 CEP, and eventually a Mr. **Meuller** of CEP spoke
 23 directly, directly to Dr. **Magel** via phone. The
 24 **subject** matter **centered** on the testing **procedures**
 25 Meuller used Meuller was strenuously defending

Page 48

1 **his** representation and insisted from two chemists
 2 that it is there and that CEP was framed.

3 Dr. **Magel** asked for the workup
 4 material that lead to CEP's conclusions. Meuller
 5 indicated all the workup material was
 6 **unaccessible** in the judge's office. Dr. **Magel**
 7 was now worried of a cover-up since logically
 8 wouldn't EPA flaunt any errors in the cover-up --
 9 in the workup rather than allow them to **be**

10 hidden? Meuller did admit that there was an
 11 error of one technician who forgot to subtract
 12 background on a few but not all specifics, but,
 13 **after** all, that background should have been very
 14 minimal in any other ordinary circumstances.

15 Knowing how serious the disposing of
 16 all the chemicals at the Manhattan Project was,
 17 **the** scientists have developed proper methods of
 18 disposal prior to their making any -- prior to
 19 **their** making any nuclear **devices**. He will assure
 20 you one of the methods did not include dumping in
 21 Uniontown, Ohio approximately five miles from
 22 **where** his granddaughters **were** reared.

23 With such a disgusting scenario Dr.
 24 **Magel** drove to Uniontown to meet Chris Borello
 25 for a personal tour of the dump. As they say,

Page 49

Page 51

1 seeing is believing. Dr. Magel reviewed the CEP
2 report and now suspected a foreign uranium source
3 found in Africa that is highly enrached --
4 enriched and certainly not found in Uniontown,
5 Ohio.

6 At his yearly medical physical Dr.
7 Magel brought and gave copies of the materials to
8 the current nuclear scientists at the Los Alamos
9 laboratories for their review and then wrote his
10 sincere recommendations to Senator Glenn.
11 Senator Glenn's office confirmed the receipt of
12 this letter via fax. Please listen to Dr.
13 Magel's words in context as he is a leading
14 national authority on plutonium.

15 Dear Senator Glenn, this is Dr.
16 Magel's words, I am writing to you at the request
17 of my son, Thomas Magel of North Canton, Ohio,
18 who is greatly disturbed by the terrible behavior
19 of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

20 He sent to me and I read large piles
21 of letters, analytical reports, maps, et cetera,
22 about the industrial excess landfill, IEL, in
23 Uniontown, Ohio.

24 Your letter of May 1st, 1997 to Chris
25 Borello, although he said Kristi Borello, Chris

1 What really galls me is the attitudes
2 and actions of EPA. There is no reason
3 whatsoever for the EPA to stand against doing
4 more honest testing, core drilling and so on by
5 one or more independent qualified labs not
6 controlled by the EPA of which I think you could
7 supply some names.

8 Much information indicates that
9 radioactive material was dumped at the IEL, and
10 it is disgusting that the Army and others in our
11 government are stonewalling and/or lying about
12 what really happened, and proving one way or the
13 other would not require some silly number of like
14 10,000 wells.

15 Senator Glenn, I know you're very
16 busy with the hearings in Washington, this is
17 obviously before he went up in space, but I feel
18 that a couple more strong calls by you can get
19 this problem out of the hands of EPA and in the
20 hands of an unbiased, honest department qualified
21 to do a good and proper job. Time is of the
22 essence so please do whatever you can to prevent
23 EPA from doing a quick and dirty cover-up Until
24 testing can show one -- once and for all if
25 radiation contamination must be handled, and this

Page 50

Page 52

1 Borello, president of Concerned Citizens of Lake
2 Township, CCLT, was certainly to the point,
3 however, I was disturbed by the May 30th CCLT
4 letter to you and Congressman Sawyer indicating
5 that EPA was not really cooperating with your
6 suggested way to resolve this matter.

7 For your information I am 79 years
8 old, a Ph.D. chemist from the University of
9 California Berkeley in 1941 and one of the very
10 early chemists, 1942, of the Manhattan Project as
11 that has described. I was sent from Chicago Labs
12 upon request by Dr. Oppenheimer to Los Alamos in
13 early 1944 to prepare the first milligram and
14 gram quantities of plutonium metal. It doesn't
15 say here but he was successful.

16 During my work at Los Alamos I became
17 contaminated with plutonium along with 25 others
18 whose health is still regularly monitored,
19 therefore, I feel knowledgeable about the concern
20 of the Concerned Citizens group who in particular
21 my son and his family in North Canton. This
22 whole subject is not a game nor is it a subject
23 that can be taken lightly or one more action may
24 be taken based on very questionable or
25 insufficient information.

1 is what I think he cares about mostly, along with
2 all those other harmful organic materials in the
3 dump.

4 Sincerely yours, Dr. Theodore T.
5 Magel. Thank you.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Ms. Magel, I've just
7 got one question.

8 MS. MAGEL: Sure.

9 MR. KAUFMAN: And it was very
10 powerful testimony. Do you believe there was
11 and/or is a cover-up as it relates to the IEL
12 case?

13 MS. MAGEL: Based on everything I've
14 heard, probably secondhand I've heard,
15 absolutely.

16 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

17 MS. MAGEL: Thank you.

18 MR. KAUFMAN: Rex E. Shover. Did I
19 pronounce it correctly?

20 MR. SHOVER: My name is Rex Shover,
21 S-H-O-V-E-R, I live at 3 707 Edison Street in
22 Uniontown.

23 I served on the volunteer fire
24 department here for 15 years, I resigned in
25 around 1976. I had a three year interruption

Page 53

1 during that 15 years while I served my country.

2 While on the fire department numerous
3 times late at night between 11 and 1:00 in the
4 morning I saw tank trucks **carrying** radioactive
5 insignia pulling into the landfill. That
6 landfill closed at 5:00. My question has always
7 **been**, why were these trucks pulling into **the**
8 landfill that late at night **duraping** something if
9 it wasn't legal?

0 MR. KAUFMAN: I **have one** quick
1 question. Did you ever get any license plate
2 numbers on any of the trucks?

3 MR. SHOVER: No, sir, I didn't.

4 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you very
5 much, Mr. Shover.

6 Greg Coleridge.

7 MR. COLERIDGE: Good evening. My
8 name is Greg Coleridge, and I'm the director of
9 Economic Justice & Empowerment Program of the
0 Northeast Ohio American **Friends** Service
1 *Committee*, which is a Quaker social action
2 organization. It's C-O-L-E-R-I-D-G-E.

3 I'd like to thank you, fiit of all,
4 Mr. Martin, Mr. Kaufman, for **being here this**
5 evening, **Miss** Post, as well for **joining** us. I'd

Page 54

1 also like to acknowledge **the** presence of another
2 guest that came out of town to be with us this
3 evening, Danielle Brian, with a group called
4 Project On Government Oversight in Washington,
5 D.C. I guess you could call it a federal
6 watchdog organization. I want you to stand up.

7 And I'd also like to acknowledge Sue
8 Ruley, who was mentioned earlier as being a
9 township trustee, who I understand goes to this
0 church and arranged for the use of this church,
1 and I wish to acknowledge **her** and her efforts in
2 her getting us this facility.

3 The American Friends Service, as I
4 mentioned, is a Quaker social action organization
5 which is founded on, among many principles, **the**
6 belief in the dignity and worth of every person
7 and to **see** that of God or good in all human
8 beings regardless of income, race, gender,
9 religion, physical ability or where they may
0 live.

1 Many people who we work with and who
2 support our work live in or near industrial
3 excess landfill here in Uniontown. For the past
4 two and one-half years we have tried as best as
5 we can to support the Concerned Citizens of Lake,

Page 55

1 Township and the Lake Township trustees in their
2 efforts to learn the truth of what is buried at
3 **IEL** and then take appropriate action to remove
4 the dangers to **the** community.

5 We have studied a bit the history, as
6 long as it is, of the **IEL**. We have analyzed
7 numerous reports from the **EPA** and various
8 scientific experts. We have read volumes of
9 correspondences between different federal
0 agencies, public officials, **CCLT** and the township
1 trustees. We have spoken directly to several
2 scientific experts who at one time were
3 intimately involved in, so to speak, digging into
4 what is in the **IEL**. We have also experienced
5 firsthand attitudes and actions of **EPA** regional
6 staff toward citizens and compared them to **EPA**
7 attitudes and actions toward representatives of
8 the polluting corporations responsible for some
9 of which is buried just down the road from where
0 we are this evening.

1 We do not claim to have a handle on
2 the complete truth, far from it. All we can do
3 is comment on what information we have analyzed,
4 who we have spoken to and what **we** have
5 experienced firsthand. From this we believe that

Page 56

1 what we have here at **IEL** is, to sum it up in one
2 single word, a mess, maybe that's two words,
3 environmentally, bureaucratically and morally.

4 **IEL** to us is first an environmental
5 mess. Chris and Mr. Titmas and others have gone
6 into that a wee bit, in fact, quite a bit. We
7 believe there is sufficient evidence to indicate
8 that **there** are chemicals and radioactive
9 compounds that are **being** ignored. **These** are
0 dangerous to the community and destructive to the
1 environment. They are not going to magically
2 evaporate unlike -- no matter what hired public
3 relations persons and labs connected to the
4 polluting corporations may claim.

5 Secondly, to us **IEL** is a bureaucratic
6 mess. **The** chief culprits are those at the top of
7 **EPA** Region 5 and at the state. **EPA** has exhibited
8 repeated screw-ups and cover-ups, half-truths and
9 half-lies, double crosses and double standards in
0 their statements and actions toward the
1 community, community groups and **township**
2 **trustees**. **They** have, to name and reiterate what
3 has already been said, a few problems, botched
4 **the** handling of testing samples, invalidated test
5 results on flimsy **grounds** showing high levels of

1 radiation, refused for many years to conduct soil
2 and gas testing, ignored concerns expressed by
3 outside technical experts as well as their own
4 technical experts which contradict preconceived
5 conclusions, replaced members on the Science
6 Advisory Board with those who, for the most part,
7 did not have radiation experience and then **used**
8 the Board's report claiming there is no radiation
9 problem as definite proof and finally have
10 claimed other agencies support their revised
11 cleanup plans when they did not.

2 We make a distinction between the
3 leadership and the professionals at these
4 agencies. We are not expressing serious concern
5 with **the** mid-level or low-level staff at EPA, for
6 the most part **these** employees are professionals
7 dedicated to the pursuit of truth based on sound
8 science. The problems **seem** to arise from the
9 upper-level employees and appointed leadership
10 and from the basic policies of the agencies
11 themselves.

12 What is unclear to us behind this EPA
13 bureaucratic mess is to what extent all this
14 deception and distortion have been done to
15 protect, if you will, the necks of the upper

1 When the polluting corporations
2 offered to send the water samples they drew to
3 their own labs, which were not certified by EPA,
4 EPA agreed, however, when community
5 representatives said they would send drawn water
6 samples, if given to them, to EPA certified labs
7 EPA still refused.

8 **When** the polluting corporations
9 claimed that no further soil or gas tests for
10 radiation are needed EPA agrees, however, **when**
11 community representatives claim, based on sound
12 advice from outside scientific experts, that
13 further testing of soils and gases for radiation
14 are needed EPA refuses.

15 Representatives of **the** polluting
16 corporations have **been** present and have an active
17 seat at the table at the federal court
18 proceedings in Cleveland concerning cleanup at
19 IEL. Representatives of the community, on the
20 other hand, only gain a seat after raising a
21 public outcry but still have no equal voice to
22 that of the polluting corporations.

23 All of these and many other double
24 standards leads one **to** ask several questions, who
25 should have more rights in our society, human

1 echelon of EPA and to what extent these actions
2 have been done to protect the, again, if you
3 will, necks of **other** entities EPA at the regional
4 and state levels have merely shielded, that is,
5 corporations, **other** federal agencies, compliant
6 public officials and branches of **the** U.S.
7 military. This certainly deserves further
8 investigation.

9 Finally, to us IEL is a moral mess.
10 The moral compass by the upper echelon of EPA and
11 others responsible for whatever lies within **the**
12 IEL has been, we believe, knocked off center.
13 **The** concerns and interests of the human beings
14 who live and work in Uniontown have been placed
15 below the concerns and interests of **other**
16 entities, certainly the polluting corporations,
17 maybe other entities as well.

18 Moral priorities have **been**
19 misplaced. There has been a double standard.

20 When the polluting corporations,
21 quote, volunteered, unquote, to lead the testing
22 round of water samples in March 1997 EPA agreed,
23 however, when the community representative showed
24 up asking to have samples drawn from the ground
25 for them EPA refused.

1 beings or corporations? Who's in charge or
2 what's in charge? Do we the people have any
3 authority over EPA or are we merely left to beg
4 or plead with EPA while their agenda too often
5 merely mirrors that of corporations? Are public
6 and administrative **policies** here affirming the
7 basic dignity and worth of human beings in this
8 area or merely affirming the narrow interests of
9 corporation? All of these, we believe, are basic
10 moral questions.

11 The problems **here** are at root, not
12 problems, as Chris Borello has said, of
13 miscommunication or misunderstanding, they are
14 problems of power and authority, who's got them
15 and who doesn't.

16 In the long-term we must all rethink
17 our relationship between ourselves and the
18 regulatory agencies like EPA that are supposed
19 to, anyway on paper, exist to serve our ends.
20 We must also rethink our relationship to
21 ourselves and corporations which have over time
22 come to assume even greater powers than
23 ourselves.

24 In the short-term there must be a
25 thorough in-depth investigation, we believe, of

Page 61

1 the IEL by the office of the federal EPA
2 ombudsman. This must be the first step preceding
3 all others. A thorough investigation of the past
4 practices, procedures and evidence is a crucial
5 start of a sequence of events. Through its
6 actions of the past decade and longer EPA
7 leadership at the federal and state levels have
8 violated whatever trust they had with the
9 community to pursue any other initial step.

10 As it's said, those who forget the
11 past are condemned to repeat it. A thorough
12 investigation of the past at the IEL is necessary
13 to ensure that past mistakes are not repeated in
14 the future. Thank you.

15 MR. KAUFMAN: Greg, I have one
16 question. Do you believe there was and/or is
17 evidence of a cover-up related to the IEL
18 activities?

19 MR. COLERIDGE: Again, I can only
20 comment based on what we have read, who we have
21 spoken to and what we have heard secondhand, and
22 it is our belief that to whatever extent, and
23 it's difficult to know to what degree it is,
24 without a question them is a cover-up.

25 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Page 62

1 (Short recess was taken.)

2 MR. KAUFMAN: Again, Werner Lange is
3 the next person providing information. Thank
4 you, Mr. Lange, I appreciate it.

5 MR. LANGE: Thank you and good
6 evening. I'm Reverend Werner Lange, ordained
7 minister in the United Church of Christ. Lange,
8 L-A-N-G-E. And I would like to add my voice in
9 the wilderness to all others who have called for
10 a full-scaled immediate and independent
11 investigation into EL. Others have spoken
12 eloquently about the clear need of such a
13 thorough investigation based upon the
14 overwhelming evidence, both direct and
15 circumstantial, of widespread and spreading
16 deadly pollution, and I echo that urgent call for
17 an independent investigation and a genuine
18 cleanup of the Uniontown site.

19 However, I encourage you, Mr. Martin,
20 Mr. Kaufman, to take one further step and make
21 this long overdue investigation truly
22 comprehensive and responsive. This toxic monster
23 euphemistically named industrial excess landfill
24 has at least two other major residences in
25 northeast Ohio, the Ravenna Arsenal and the

Page 63

1 Ashtabula River.

2 Like the IEL both of these sites
3 contain an enormous amount of extremely hazardous
4 and toxic waste dumped there by many of the same
5 companies and much for the same reasons. Like
6 the IEL these highly toxic waste dumps exists in
7 communities occupied by either low income or
8 moderate income Americans, ones evidently deemed
9 vulnerable, if not downright expendable, by the
10 polluters.

11 Together these three sites form a
12 trinity of death, disease and denial. Each is a
13 real and present danger to the residents in
14 northeast Ohio. Each is filled with carcinogens,
15 including radioactive waste, dumped secretly and
16 illegally by irresponsible military industrial
17 complex, and each site has also been the focus of
18 official neglect by the EPA. Consequently,
19 citizens like us, which these government agencies
20 are duty bound to protect, have been and continue
21 to be exposed to extremely toxic, hazardous and
2 even radioactive substances.

3 Residents near each of these sites
4 have been suffering and dying from unnaturally
5 high rates of cancer for years, and this man-made

Page 64

1 tragedy continues to this day. And because it is
2 a man-made tragedy it is also a crime but it is
3 more than a crime, I submit it is a moral
4 outrage, one that is compounded by organized
5 cover-up which has as much contempt for the truth
6 as the corporate polluters have for the lives and
7 the lawyers of their victims.

8 Corporate polluters that are
9 responsible for this ongoing destruction of life,
0 health and truth have used intimidation,
1 co-optation and disinformation to cover up their
2 criminal negligence in disposing radioactive,
3 toxic and hazardous waste in the back yards and
4 rivers of northeast Ohio residents. At each site
5 corporate polluters have employed and continue to
6 employ high-powered PR agents to cover up their
7 crimes, slick masters of deceit and purveyors of
8 junk science who are called upon to produce one
9 lie after the other to undermine discovery and to
0 undermine broadcast of the horrific truth that
1 they have created.

2 And their latest lie, you've heard it
3 tonight, is called natural attenuation, a code
4 phrase for do nothing and an invitation for more
5 ecological violence. Natural attenuation is an

Page 65

Page 67

1 unnatural fraud. In fact, it is an anti-natural
2 sin, a blasphemy against the Supernatural, and
3 God will not be mocked by such lies, by such
4 crimes and by such sins and nor will the citizens
5 of this state and this region.

6 I submit to you that it is both
7 sinful and criminal to inflict these toxin wounds
8 upon Mother Nature and tell her to go heal
9 thyself. It is both sinful and criminal to
○ inflict these fatal diseases upon area residents
1 and then blame them for the demise. It is both
2 sinful and criminal to dump **these** deadly
3 substances into our back yards and refuse to
4 accept cost and responsibility for their
5 removal. And finally, it is both sinful and
6 criminal to do all this damage and then lie about
7 it blatantly through cover-ups, junk science and
8 intellectual prostitution.

9 An ancient wisdom instructs us that
○ in war truth is the first casualty. In this
1 domestic war truth continues to be a casualty and
2 so do many, many residents afflicted by cancer.
3 This corporate culture of death and disease must
4 end, and let **the** beginning of that end start
5 right now right **here** in **the** house of one who

1 Uniontown, Ohio. W-I-T-S-A-M-A-N.

2 As I said, my name's Terry Witsaman,
3 I've been with Concerned Citizens for the last 13
4 years. I got in in the beginning, and I'm going
5 to be here at the end. And the residence where
6 we previously lived I can -- we've experienced
7 what toxic chemicals can do and how they make you
8 feel because our residential well was
9 contaminated with two of **the** toxic chemicals that
10 **were** and are at **the** landfill right now.

11 Also, my **daughter** went to the day
12 care center that used to **be** at the landfill. One
13 day we got a call from them, they told us to come
14 and get her because they were evacuating the day
15 care **center** because it might explode because of
16 the methane gas.

17 But what I want to talk to you
18 tonight about is I was **the** project manager, and
19 the technical assistance grant, one of them, that
20 our group, Concerned Citizens of Lake Township,
21 received and the fact that presently the EPA has
22 let the polluters do **the** sampling up at the site
23 and **the** polluters write **the** report and the
24 polluters do the **negotiation** behind closed doors
25 in Cleveland with a judge and excluding citizens

Page 66

Page 68

1 promised you shall know the truth and **the** truth
2 shall set you free. Mr. Martin, let that promise
3 be fulfilled for the sake of our children, for
4 the sake of our children's **children** and their
5 descendants to the seventh generation and
6 beyond. Thank you.

7 MK. KAUFMAN: Is it Reverend Lange?

8 MR. LANGE: Yes.

9 MR. KAUFMAN: Reverend Lange, just
○ one quick question. Do you believe there was
1 and/or is a cover-up related to the IEL case?

2 MR. LANGE: With **every** fiber in my
3 body.

4 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, sir.

5 Roy Campbell is the next individual
6 on the list who wanted to provide information, is
7 Mr. Campbell still here?

8 Okay. Terry Witsaman, is that
9 pronounced correctly, sir?

3 MR. WITSAMAN: Yeah, Witsaman.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Witsaman. Sorry,
2 Terry.

3 MR. WITSAMAN: My name's Terry
4 Witsaman, 1785 Spotwood, Northwest, Uniontown,
5 Ohio, **formerly** of 39 19 Edison Street, Northwest,

1 to me is beyond belief and that should be
2 investigated.

3 I know when we first got the
4 technical assistance grant when **we** were hiring
5 our contractors, one of **the** things that was
6 specified in that grant was that anyone we hired
7 could not have any contact and could not have
8 done any work for the polluters at that site and
9 yet U.S. EPA now has let a consortium of rubber
10 companies do the testing that has lead up to this
11 new revelation on natural **attenuation**. I think
12 there is -- even though it is legal I think there
13 is an inherent conflict of interest and I think
14 it's wrong.

15 Superfund law -- one of the things
16 that the Environmental Protection Agency is
17 supposed to do is protect **the** environment, and in
18 Superfund law they're supposed to protect an
19 environment in a Superfund site by reducing the
20 toxicity, the mobility and the volume of
21 hazardous waste at that **site**. Now, as you've
22 heard, there was over a million gallons of
23 liquids dumped at that site and 780,000 tons of
24 solids. **They're** also supposed to restore the
25 **groundwater** to its beneficial use.

Page 69

1 Now, 15 years ago when this began I
2 had a lot of faith that U.S. EPA, the
3 Environmental Protection Agency, was going to
4 protect us, and I thought **that** they were going to
5 do exactly what the law prescribed they should
6 do, which is reduce the toxicity, mobility and
7 volume of constituents of **that** site. They're
8 also supposed to protect you from release or
9 threatened release of toxic chemicals from that
0 site. It's been 15 years and I have to ask the
1 ombudsman is EPA doing **their** job? Are they doing
2 their public mandate, their mandate by Congress,
3 and is this, is this what **Congress** wanted them to
4 do?

5 15 years, it's **been** 15 years. In
6 that 15 years every year, and this is according
7 to the dumpers' own contractor, 27 percent of all
8 rainwater that comes out of **the** sky that you see
9 in this town every year **filters** down through that
0 dump and pushes **the** toxic chemicals out of the
1 dump, pushes more of them out of the dump, pushes
2 **them** maybe to your house. If you're not on
3 alternate water supply, because they keep talking
4 about the alternate water supply is protecting
5 all of **Uniontown**, well, all of Uniontown is not

Page 70

1 on alternate water and it is not protecting
2 everyone in Uniontown.

3 So I think the ombudsman, I have
4 trouble with that word, has to look at that, is
5 EPA doing their job here? Are they protecting us
6 in a timely manner? I don't think so. I don't
7 think they're protecting anyone because all the
8 things that I told you about in the **Superfund**
9 law, they have not done one thing to protect a
0 single person other than put a limited alternate
1 water supply in this town.

2 Everyone else, everyone else is at
3 risk and I for one, I am mad as **hell**. It's been
4 15 years and I don't think anyone in this room
5 and anyone that reads about this meeting or hears
6 about this meeting should take this anymore.

7 It's really good to see all these
8 faces in the audience. I see a lot of old faces
9 that used to come to the meetings. I think the
0 U.S. EPA is waiting us out, waiting for US all to
1 die, waiting for us all to get tied of fighting
2 this fight, but we're not going to do that.
3 We're going to keep on fighting, and we are
4 ultimately going to win this thing.

5 Currently this insanity about natural

Page 71

1 attenuation at **this** site -- I have before me,
2 there's a 27 page document. I went over to the
3 library in **Hartville** and I found this document,
4 and the document is on implementing natural
5 attenuation at Superfund sites, so I thought,
6 well, I'll take a look at this document, I'll
7 have a look at the whole thing. Well, curiously
8 every other page of this document was missing,
9 and this is what governs, this is one of the
10 guidelines that U.S. EPA uses in implementing a
11 remedy, nonremedy, if you will, of natural
12 attenuation, and I thought it was very curious
13 that that document was as -- would **be** very
14 important and very helpful to citizens in this
15 town that only every other page of it was there.
16 I was able to find it on **the**
17 Internet, and after reading it I can't believe
18 that U.S. EPA would even think of implementing a
19 remedy of natural attenuation at this site.
20 They're only using this remedy at six sites in
21 **the** whole country and most of those are oil
22 spills. We have a very complex site that doesn't
23 fit the characteristics of this report saying
24 that that remedy should be implemented at a
25 site.

Page 72

1 And one other thing, part of **the**
2 technical assistance grant or the whole purpose
3 of the technical assistance grant was to involve
4 citizens in the decision-making process at **the**
5 site. What was going to happen at the site, you
6 have the decision in making that decision what
7 was going to happen to you, how was it going to
8 affect your property values, your lives, your
9 kids' lives and future generations' lives.

10 And up to the point of the record of
11 decision we did have citizen participation at
12 public-meetings and we had technical assistance
13 grant, we hired experts to review EPA's data. We
14 weren't allowed to do any testing of our own and
15 we weren't allowed to test any samples from them
16 with these experts but we were able to hire these
17 experts to review their data. Our experts didn't
18 agree with their data. They didn't agree even
19 actually with the record of decision at this
20 site, but it was better, certainly much better
21 than what we're getting now, which is basically
22 nothing.

23 **The** rubber companies from the very
24 beginning have said that there's no problem with
25 this site, there should be no cap on this site,

1 there should be no add to this site, none of
2 these chemicals are affecting-anybody from this
3 site according to their report from 1995, I
4 believe.

5 And it's really curious that Linda
6 Kern in a transmittal U.S. EPA response that she
7 responded to comments by the company on the 61st
8 cent & sign, she was a project manager for U.S.
9 EPA on the site, she says in this report right
o here, she categorically denies everything that
1 U.S. EPA -- all the evidence they're using to
2 implement this natural attenuation remedy. And
3 I'd like to know how they can reverse themselves
4 with such stodgy evidence. They're contradicting
5 their own on-site project manager, they're
6 contradicting 15 years worth of investigation
7 with about a year and a half or two years worth
8 and in doing so they've shut you out completely
9 because the only chance you have legally -- now,
o this is something in addition here, but the only
1 chance you have to legally participate was the 60
2 day public comment period, and all they have to
3 do is look at them and say, We don't agree with
4 your comments and they can implement that remedy
5 or no remedy.

1 So I'm asking you now and I'm asking
2 the ombudsman now to do all you can to
3 investigate what's going on with this site for
4 the last 15 years, what's going on with this site
5 now so that we can get a cleanup, a cleanup, not
6 a natural attenuation but we can actually do what
7 the EPA is supposed to do and that is protect our
8 environment and they are not doing it now. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. KAUFMAN: Two quick questions.
1 You mention alternate water, approximately what
2 percentage of people, if you know, within a one
3 mile radius of the site are on alternate water?

4 MR. WITSAMAN: I couldn't tell you
5 with any accuracy what percentage of the people
6 within a one mile radius are on alternate water,
7 but I can tell you that most of the people that
8 are on alternate water are west of the dump,
9 north and northwest of the dump. Anyone that is
1 north of the dump pretty much and east of the
2 dump and there's a few houses south of the dump
3 are not on alternate water.

4 MR. KAUFMAN: To your knowledge has
5 any contamination been found in areas north, east
6 and south of the dump?

1 MR. WITSAMAN: Yeah, there was
2 contamination, and I have a report over there,
3 that was found in northwest Uniontown. There was
4 a number of houses that had contamination,
5 including ours, in their drinking water wells
6 above the -- that were a health risk standard.

7 In fact, I think the Stark County
8 Health Commissioner, Bill Franks, is he in the
9 room yet? Well, he was here. Oh, he's here.

10 At the time he had told the people
11 that had the contamination in their wells not to
12 have any contact with the water, not to bathe in
13 it, not to drink it, not to inhale, you know, off
14 gases from steam or anything else. Is that
15 correct, Mr. Franks?

16 MR. FRANKS: Yes.

17 MR. KAUFMAN: And those areas are
18 within approximately one mile of the site?

19 MR. WITSAMAN: That area is within a
20 half mile of the dump as the crow flies.

21 MR. KAUFMAN: And are there any
22 alternate water systems in that area?

23 MR. WITSAMAN: Yes, there is.

24 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Are there areas
25 where there aren't alternate water where

1 contamination has been found within a mile of the
2 dump, to your knowledge, and you may not know?

3 MR. WITSAMAN: Chris, could you help
4 me on this? I would say in the area where there
5 is alternate water, not all the people are hooked
6 up to the alternate water for -- some of them for
7 economic reasons, they can't afford it, they're
8 too old, they're on pensions, there's not an
9 economic way they can do it, and so those people
10 are still threatened by the contamination.

11 EPA did a study on contamination in
12 northwest Uniontown, and I don't know if we can
13 have any faith in that study, they said there was
14 no link, they didn't think it was coming from the
15 dump.

16 MR. KAUFMAN: Is this within a mile
17 of the dump?

18 MR. WITSAMAN: A half mile.

19 MR. KAUFMAN: Within a half mile of
20 the dump.

21 MR. WITSAMAN: They didn't think it
22 was coming from the dump, but they didn't know
23 where it was coming from.

24 MR. KAUFMAN: Do you --

25 MR. WITSAMAN: And I want to say,

Page 77

1 too, that especially concerning what's going on
2 right now, **you** have to consider the potential for
3 **release**, not just whether there's a contamination
4 plume moving off that site, **there** may be
5 contamination plumes in our neighborhood around
6 **here**.

7 We don't know it because EPA only
8 tests, especially **lately** as **Chris** said, **they**
9 **tested** for five years. They **only** test basically
10 on the site and around **the** site on the monitoring
11 wells that they have, and as I stated **before**,
12 number one, they don't have enough monitoring
13 wells, and I think almost all the experts would
14 agree on that.

15 They haven't done **core** samples on
16 that and just on the threat of the potential for
17 release from that site in any direction because
18 **the** water from that site, according to U.S. EPA
19 and U.S. **GS**, flows in all directions, a **very**
20 complex geological site on **the** top of that hill,
21 it's a glacial hill, it's **bedrock**, shale,
22 limestone, it's a whole mishap layer cake that
23 got hit by a bowling ball, and so to monitor that
24 site, **according** to what **I've** read, you would need
25 a much more complex monitoring system. And to

Page 78

1 characterize that site you would need a much,
2 much more complex set of criteria to characterize
3 that site because natural attenuation, this
4 insane remedy they have for the **site** is based on
5 -- a lot of it's **based** on computer models and
6 mathematical models, and if you don't have good
7 data, and this is according to **the** U.S. EPA
8 themselves, **the** models are only as good as the
9 data that goes in them.

10 Since we think and a lot of experts
11 feel that the data they have from that site,
12 because of the inadequacy **of** the wells or the
13 bore holes and so forth and so on, a computer
14 model or any model they have right now is just
15 junk, it's junk science as someone else said when
16 they stood up here.

17 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much,
18 sir.

19 MS. BORELLO: **The last time we sought**
20 an account of how many people were on well water
21 versus not, I believe the County Sanitary
22 Engineer said 30 percent of the people was not
23 hooked up, were not hooked up to **the** city water,
24 30 **percent** was the last figure.

25 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you,

Page 79

1 Chris.

2 **See** if I'm reading this right,
3 Darlene Lansing; is that correct? Did I
4 pronounce your name correctly?

5 MS. LANSING: Lansing.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Lansing, I'm sorry.

7 MS. LANSING: My **name's** Darlene
8 Lansing, L-A-N-S-I-N-G. I live at 2177 Prestwick
9 Drive, Uniontown. For 12 years I lived at 11695
10 Basswood Avenue, which is in a one mile radius of
11 **the** landfill.

12 **I'm** a registered nurse, for a living
13 I do medical research. I've come to discuss
14 health care issues on the landfill. In the '70s
15 when I first moved to Uniontown --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we ask **you**
17 to use the mike, we can't hear you?

18 MS. LANSING: Can you hear **me** now?
19 Okay. In the '70s when I moved to Basswood
20 Avenue and first was aware of the dump I had
21 **compiled** a list of cancers on Pine Street and
22 **other** streets immediately around the dump. The
23 **people who lived in those homes at that time were**
24 **in their 50s and 60s, and when I gave it to the**
25 **health** department and the EPA they thanked me for

Page 80

1 my efforts and told me that **they** were old and
2 they had to die from something and cancer was the
3 second highest cause of deaths so, therefore,
4 they weren't concerned.

5 Over the years I've expressed concern
6 over chemicals. I wasn't **aware** of radiation
7 being an issue until **the '90s**, so my focus had
8 always been on the chemicals. I don't remember
9 exactly how many chemicals were found but
10 phthalates and other chemicals are known -- and
11 **benzene** are known carcinogens and the incidence
12 of cancer that were antidotal were amazing to
13 me. I've left the area and became aware of
14 radiation in the '90s.

15 I developed myself a cancer in the
16 late '90s and became again interested and went
17 back and looked at antidotal cases and went back
18 and asked people in the area. I found **seven**
19 breast cancers within two blocks -- you could
20 stand out of one lady's house and see all the
21 others, one mile -- within a mile radius of the
22 landfill directly west of the landfill. I found
23 **fibroid** disease, thyroid cancer, spinal tumors,
24 about 22 cases within a one mile radius of breast
25 cancer alone, let's see, brain cancer and

Page 81

Page 83

1 lymphoma. There was a child born without a
2 brain. There is a high incidence of learning
3 disabilities according to one of the instructors
4 at Lake Schools. There were three or four
5 children with leukemia within a ten year period.

6 The 1992 cancer incidence report put
7 out by the Ohio Department of Health list a high
8 amount, higher than the national average, of
9 breast cancer, Cole cancer, brain cancer and
10 lymphoma and leukemia in Stark County.

11 The health department has, I
12 understand, now the capabilities of breaking this
13 down by ZIP code. I have requested this six
14 times and have not yet received that breakdown.
15 By law Ohio has to keep a list of cancers, and
16 the only thing so far compiled is a 1992, there
17 has not been able to compile anything else.

18 I've asked ATSDR, EPA and the health
19 department in the '70s to do a health study, and
20 I realize it's a small area and significantly
21 could not truly do a **health** study but they could
22 have done -- requested people who had illnesses
23 to call in so they could have found out if this
24 town versus a town right down the street like
25 Manchester had higher numbers of cancers in a

1 had about migration were addressed by Mr. Titmas,
2 but to go along with what your last person said,
3 I had lived here probably 11 years beginning in
4 about 1969 perhaps, and from the time I was a
5 child I had had a little skin irritation once or
6 twice a year, for a day it would bother me. Once
7 I moved to Uniontown it became dramatically worse
8 and to the extent that after living here a couple
9 of years I was advised to have a baseline
10 biopsy.

11 About 16 years ago it was cancer and
12 there was no -- it was the type of cancer that
13 could be caused by chemical irritation. I don't
14 know if you know what a vulvectomy is, but I had
15 a vulvectomy and all the other problems that go
16 with that. For every year since then I have had
17 to have biopsies of surrounding areas. During
18 that same period of time in those early years I
19 had two daughters that began to have skin
20 problems. **When** they left my home they weren't
21 bothered anymore, if they came back for a visit
22 **they were**.

23 About probably 13 years ago maybe **we**
24 began to buy bottled water but this did not -- we
25 **didn't** bathe in it, we cooked with it, we drank

Page 82

Page 84

1 **similar** population amount and they haven't done
2 that either.

3 And I, again, requested a health
4 study in the '90s, and I talked to a Dr. -- to
5 Linda Kern who said, again, the area was too
6 small. I said to her I would do it myself and
7 she told me to go ahead, it wouldn't prove
8 anything anyway, and truthfully scientifically it
9 doesn't prove anything but you can get an idea of
10 what the cancer rate is of this town versus a
11 town ten miles away.

12 And then I guess that's all -- I have
13 a formal statement I'll mail in, but that's
14 basically all I have to say.

15 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank **you** very much,
16 Mrs. Lansing.

17 Nonna Bolt. Did I pronounce that
18 correctly?

19 MS. BOLT: Norma Bolt, 3636
20 Timberlake, probably less than a half mile from
21 **the** dump.

22 When I signed your paper most of the
23 things that I was interested in, or concerned
24 about is a better word, have been addressed by
25 **the** other speakers and particularly questions I

1 it but we didn't bathe in it, so we were still
2 exposed to the well water and whatever was in the
3 well water. As soon as we could financially
4 handle it we got a complete in-house treatment
5 system, and then we were one of the first homes
6 after the hundred homes that were able to get the
7 city water.

8 I filed for a variance to keep my
9 well open so if you want to test you're welcome
10 to test it. My home has **been** one of the homes
11 that the EPA included in testing and there was
12 tritium found in my well but that was tossed
13 out. I don't know what was wrong with that one.

14 And at one time I had a complete fish
15 kill. I had a lot of fish in a pond, they
16 floated **all** belly up. **Well**, I put one in the
17 freezer and gave that to **the** EPA and they did
18 find chemicals in that but. not sufficient amount
19 or at least **they** didn't think it was a sufficient
20 amount that could have **come** from the dump that
21 would cause that.

22 But I've always **been** active with the
23 CCLT because I have tried so hard to provide a
24 healthy environment for the kids and to think
25 that money would cause the problems that I might

Page 85

1 I have incurred. In the same year that I had
2 cancer surgery two neighbors on either side had
3 cancer surgery, one of those has now died. It
4 made me really angry because I knew that anybody
5 that would do that knew what they were doing. So
6 when you ask these other people if there's been
7 cover-up, I definitely believe there has been. I
8 can't -- I've been associated with the group for
9 as long as I have and not felt that way.

0 MR. KAUFMAN: I have a couple of
1 quick questions, Ms. Bolt. You said that your
2 well was tested and came up positive for tritium
3 and then the data was thrown out. Did anyone
4 come back and retest the well and find no
5 tritium?.

6 MS. BOLT: Right.

7 MR. KAUFMAN: That's what happened?

8 MS. BOLT: (Nods head up and down.)

9 MR. KAUFMAN: They came and found
0 tritium and then they came back and didn't find
1 tritium?

2 MS. BOLT: Well, if they found it it
3 wasn't as significant as it was the first time.

4 MR. KAUFMAN: And this is the
5 groundwater well'?

Page 86

1 MS. BOLT: This is the groundwater
2 well.

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Did anyone explain to
4 you that pollution can move in slugs in the
5 groundwater so that you might have a slug coming
6 in one day --

7 MS. BOLT: Right.

8 MR. KAUFMAN: -- and then six months
9 later it might be less --

0 MS. BOLT: Right.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: -- and then six months
2 later it would be more?

3 MS. BOLT: Right, I understood that.
4 And part of the concern I had with the migration
5 of chemicals was addressed by Mr. Titmas.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Great.

7 MS. BOLT: So I understand those
8 things.

9 MR. KAUFMAN: Good. Did they just
0 throw out the first data because the second time
1 they got a different reading?

2 MS. BOLT: I don't know.

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. And who took the
4 -- did the analysis?

5 MS. BOLT: It was the State.

Page 87

1 MR. KAUFMAN: The State of Ohio EPA?

2 MS. BOLT: (Nods head up and down.)

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Do you remember the
4 individual's name?

5 MS. BOLT: Chris could help me on
6 that, she's got a better memory than I do.

7 MS. BORELLO: I don't remember.

8 MR. KAUFMAN: That's okay. Thank you
9 very much, Ms. Bolt, I appreciate it.

10 MS. BOLT: It's been a long time ago.

11 MR. KAUFMAN: The next speaker, John
12 Thompson. It's not the former coach of
13 Georgetown basketball team, is it? No, you're
14 not tall enough.

15 MR. THOMPSON: No, that's not me. My
16 name is John Thompson, I live on Christine
17 Circle. I have to say hi to Terry, I haven't
18 seen him in about 15 years. Christine Circle,
19 Northwest.

20 I have to admit I owe you people,
21 every one of you an apology. The reason I say
22 that, I've only been out here a couple of years,
23 I got a brand-new house and I didn't really think
24 this was important because of where I lived.

25 I don't have any information to give

Page 88

1 you people. I just want to say that apparently
2 where I live, after listening to all these other
3 people, possibly my well and the well of about 17
4 other people, we might be in trouble.

5 I have a couple questions, if I could
6 get them entered into the record that would make
7 us feel a lot better.

8 MR. KAUFMAN: Absolutely.

9 MR. THOMPSON: One being, how did
10 they determine where to stop the testing of the
11 wells, what was the determining factor?

12 The other question would be if we pay
13 a private contractor to come and test our wells
14 and they're found to contain some of these things
15 that I've never even heard of, what's our next
16 recourse of action?

17 Our houses are probably a mile, maybe
18 less than a mile, west of the landfill as the
19 crow flies, and, again, I'm just kind of curious
20 why our wells weren't tested?

21 I guess the only statement or comment
22 that I have in closing, if any of you ever seen
23 or watched the movie Air Force One, just remember
24 what Harrison Ford said, You got to do it because
25 it's the right thing. That's all I got to say.

Page 89

Page 91

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Herb Kohler.

2 MR. KOHLER: That's Herb Kohler,
3 K-O-H-L-E-R, 10995 Wright Road.

4 I started in CCLT when I had a three
5 year old child. That three year old is going to
6 get her license this year, so says a lot about
7 priorities, I guess. Glad to know that she's
8 still here.

9 I only have -- most of the good
o questions have been asked so I'll ask the ones
1 that I don't think are covered as much as I'd
2 like. The first one is, why after radiation was
3 discovered in 1991 and never invalidated did we
4 not go back and test the same bore holes or
5 rebore new holes near the same holes? And why
6 did we not run the same protocol for testing
7 looking for the same radioisotopes that were
8 found previously?

9 It appears that what happened was we
0 went back and tested for different radioisotopes
1 at different locations and then sort of played
2 shell game with the information. I think the
3 correct political term for that is spin today.

4 The second question I have is that
5 why is it that with the multitude of labs that we

1 was incomplete?

2 Finally, going back to that same
3 radiation expert, I'd like to know why he was
4 permitted to work on this site when his father
5 worked for one of the PRPs?

6 Also, I hate to say I told you so,
7 and I guess our group's been saying that for
8 awhile, we said in 1989 that this site was
9 inadequately characterized. We said that the
10 record of decision definitely should have been
11 signed and we said sooner or later that was going
12 to come back to haunt us. We were told that this
13 was the best record of decision that we could get
14 at the time and that not to worry, that during
15 the development of the work plan we fix all those
16 little holes, we go back and we patch it up and
17 we make sure that the cleanup that we got here
18 would be everything that we deserved. Now,
19 depends on what you mean by the word deserved. I
20 think it would be an understatement to say that
21 the EPA has had their own agenda here.

22 The question has been asked and I
23 suspect you'll ask me at the same time whether or
24 not I feel that there is a conspiracy or a
25 cover-up here. With the usual disclaimers, that

Page 90

Page 92

1 have today, with the amount of automation that
2 exists today does it take a minimum of eight
3 months to get test results back? Why do we have
4 to get results sometimes a year and a half,
5 almost two years and why do those results
6 miraculously seem to appear if they're positive
7 before meetings and if they're negative do they
8 not appear until after meetings?

9 The third question I would like to
o ask, why does EPA ignore its own guidelines for
1 the handling of waste streams within this site?
2 Why do they require in their own guidelines a
3 more stringent characterization for natural
4 attenuation than for an active remedial method
5 and then turn around and at a site where we were
6 inadequately characterized for an active
7 remediation tell us that we are now perfectly
3 fine with natural attenuation?

9 I'd like to know why the EPA
o radiation expert was as well cheated and the
1 health physics major with three or four weeks of
2 seminar training and why he was put in charge of
3 guiding the Science Advisory Board through all of
4 the data? I'd like to know why the data sent
5 that the Science Advisory Board had to work with

1 is to say that I have no direct knowledge of
2 anyone writing down a memo that says, Today we
3 are going to work on the cover-up. I would say
4 that the circumstantial evidence pattern is
5 rather high based on what I have observed over
6 the last 12, 13 years.

7 Now, finally, I'm very thankful that
8 you're here. This has been a refreshing area of
9 a lot of problems that have gone on here over the
10 last 12, 15 years, and I thank you for being
11 here.

12 MR. KAUFMAN: I still have a question
13 for you. Since you've been with it a long time,
14 do you feel the federal government, no matter
15 what agency, given the antidotal information of
16 health problems has done an adequate job in
17 assessing the magnitude of health problems in
18 this particular area where a major source of
19 contamination has been identified?

20 MR. KOHLER: No, I don't but I'll
21 qualify that by saying that since all of the data
22 that exists today that they're allowed to
23 consider is based on eight hour exposure limits
24 for single chemicals and since the majority of
25 the people that we have affected here are dealing

Page 93

1 with chemicals that have synergistic effects, I
2 think it is damn near impossible to **be** able to
3 **gather** the full magnitude of what the effect on
4 human health is.

5 Almost -- I think every time we've
6 talked about it, Denise **Gawlinski** is back there,
7 I think she can tell us what she's told us
8 before, that is that eight hour exposures are
9 based on industrial data that's gathered when
0 people -- when they're able to separate people
1 being exposed to one fixed chemical.

2 We have a **number of** instances where
3 when we've taken data over the years, there may
4 **be three**, four, five chemicals of the same
5 chemical family that in each case each member of
6 that family is carcinogenic. Now, if one of them
7 is three points short of **the** standard for action
8 and the other one is four points short of the
9 standard of action and the other one is five
0 points short on wherever scale, parts per
1 million, parts per **billion**, is appropriate. We
2 **can't sum those according to the EPA because no**
3 data exists for **multiple chemicals**. So we're
4 prepared to live with that even though we're just
5 **that** short of being in an emergency action

Page 94

1 situation for a number **of the** wells that are **out**
2 **there**.

3 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Now, to your knowledge,
4 and I know you're not an expert, do you know if
5 the standards or has anyone told you the
6 standards for emergency action take into account
7 low body weight children drinking potentially
8 contaminated water **or do the** numbers only reflect
9 healthy adult males exposed for eight hours a
0 day? If you don't know, that's fine.

1 **MR. KOHLER:** I believe that all of
2 the data on exposure to chemicals comes from
3 healthy adult males. I don't know that for a
4 certainty, but since their industrial exposure
5 data my guess is is that that would be the case.

6 **MR. KAUFMAN:** As a parent, this is a
7 subjective question, do you **feel** comfortable that
8 the health of your children, especially when
9 they're small with low body weight, is being
0 protected if industrial levels are used as **the**
1 criteria for protection?

2 **MR. KOHLER:** Subjectively and any
3 other way, no.

4 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Okay. Thank you very
5 much, sir.

Page 94

1 And finally Louise Fabinski from the
2 ATSDR. Oh, we've got two more, all right, not
3 finally. Louise Fabinski.

4 **MS. FABINSKI:** Hi. My name is
5 Louise Fabinski, I work for **the** U.S. Public
6 Health Service, it's the agency for toxic
7 substances and disease registry.
8 F-A-B-I-N-S-K-I.

9 Under the civil fund legislation
10 Congress wanted to have a public health agency
11 look at **the** data that was found in **Superfund**
12 sites and try to make some kind of judgment as to
13 what exposure to those chemicals would mean to
14 the health of the public and also to make sure
15 that any remedy that **EPA**, either U.S. **EPA** or
16 state, environmentally would select would be
17 protective of public health.

18 That's what we have tried to do at
19 this site for the last 15 years. I've been
20 coming here since 1984. I started with the
21 agency in 1983, and I still see. in the front row
22 a lot of people that I met over the years and
23 somebody in the second row, too, and it's always
24 been a delight to come to this community.

25 We were instrumental in making sure

Page 95

1 that **there** was an alternate water supply. I
2 **remember Milly** Griffith very well, and there were
3 two or three wells that had vinyl chloride. We
4 also were instrumental in working with **EPA**, and
5 just before the **ROD** was signed **there was an**
6 increase in the methane levels that we felt could
7 cause a problem in **the** border homes. And so we
8 asked them until they were sure they controlled
9 **the** methane could they move these **people** for
10 public safety.

11 The determination to buy out those
12 homes was not a determination that **ATSDR** made,
13 that was one that U.S. **EPA** made. There was a
14 technical information committee and so each one
15 of these issues that you heard discussed, core
16 sampling, radiation and water, cancer, health
17 studies, the original remedial alternatives, the
18 designs, et cetera, technical people from Atlanta
19 including health physicists, hydrogeologists did
20 look at the data in a team and did fly up here
21 and produce written documents and dialogue with
22 the other agencies and with the public who
23 **attended** the PRC.

24 Now, the group for government
25 oversight we have never met with before, I don't

1 I know who they are. We will attempt to establish
2 some kind of connection with them. Also **the**
3 group of friends, they've never contacted us and
4 discussed any of these opinions or data with us
5 so we will definitely make contact with them.

6 Also, EPA is proposing to change
7 their alternative to this site and that's an
8 important term, PRP holes. Our agency does not
9 sit on negotiations with the PRP for one very
0 good reason, we need to be objective. We don't
1 have regulatory power but we certainly do have
2 public media power, and if that alternative is
3 not protective of public health, and I'm not a
4 technical person so I can't discuss all the
5 ramifications, but I will tell you that there are
6 meetings and have been meetings going on with
7 those agencies to make sure it's protective of
8 public health. This has not been deserted yet,
9 it is not final that this will be an implemented
0 remedy.

1 I trust my agency **very** much, I know
2 the people who work **for** it and I would find it
3 very hard to believe they would be willing to
4 endanger your health.

5 I'd like you to ask me the question

1 you asked the man ahead of me.

2 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Well, I was going to.
3 About the protection levels taking low body
4 weight, young children ingesting water, are those
5 -- are the protection levels based on that or
6 based on healthy adult males?

7 **MS. FABINSKI:** **Well**, you work for EPA
8 and you know what **MCLs** are and some of the other
9 regulations there are and you know what risk
0 assessment is and so does my agency, so **does** Ohio
1 EPA, and when we look at these kind of sites,
2 yes, you must protect to the best of your ability
3 those in the population that are **more** sensitive,
4 which would be ultimately and would also include
5 children so you would take into consideration low
6 body weight. That's always been **done**.

7 Now, are there **research** studies that
8 we get from occupational health that help us get
9 some idea of the toxicity of chemicals, yes, but,
0 you know, levels are adjusted for children and
1 adults -- and unhealthy adults.

2 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Now, what is your --
3 are you a Ph.D. or a doctor?

4 **MS. FABINSKI:** No, I said many --

5 **MR. KAUFMAN:** **What's** your

1 background?

2 **MS. FABINSKI:** --times I was **not** a
3 technical expert. I have a Bachelor of Science
4 **Degree** in English and biology and worked for this
5 agency since 1983.

6 **MR. KAUFMAN:** So you don't agree with
7 Bill Ruckelshaus, the former administrator of EPA,
8 when **he** said that risk assessment is like a
9 prisoner of war, if you torture it enough it will
0 tell you what you want to know?

1 **MS. FABINSKI:** **I am** not a technical
2 person, I will not let you draw me into that
3 question or statement.

4 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Okay. Thank you very
5 much.

6 The next -- the next speaker is Tom
7 Shalala, is that correct? **You're** not related to
8 the secretary, are you?

9 **MR. SHALALA:** **Yes**.

0 **MR. KAUFMAN:** You are. Well.

1 **MR. SHALALA:** My name is Tom Shalala,
2 and I don't know any of you, we moved here about
3 a year ago so I come **here** -- I don't even know
4 what this group is so I don't come here with a
5 lot of emotion or anything **like** that.

1 I am a scientist, I'm a

2 **hydrogeologist**, I've been one for 15 years, and
3 we live in Uniontown about a mile from here, and
4 I just have some general questions that I'd like
5 to present and address with all these other ones,
6 and I think some of them have been covered
7 earlier.

8 And one is the **issue** of dissolved
9 oxygen is kind of a buzz word in **the**
0 environmental field. Everybody uses dissolved
1 oxygen, it is a proof that degradation is taking
2 place and I understand that, but there's so many
3 factors that go into that and the -- I have not
4 read all the information at all, but just the
5 stuff that I have read, **they're** kind of using
6 that saying, Well, there's some dissolved oxygen
7 here, that means there's degradation taking
8 place.

9 There's been, as **far** as I know, no
0 studies taking place on any kind of microbial
1 studies that have been done that **the** right
2 bacteria's been there.

3 Second of all, you're dealing also
4 with metals and apparently with radiation as
5 well, which microbes are not going to deal with.

Page 101

1 Also, I worked for industry for many
2 years **and** in the environmental business, and we
3 sat across the table from many state agencies and
4 **the** U.S. EPA and we would **try** to trick with the.
5 U.S. EPA and they would come back and say to us,
6 Dilution is not **the** solution. We've tried it and
7 it doesn't work, and now we're saying in this
8 case dilution is the solution **and** it's not.

9 And then lastly is that a cap is fine
10 for a landfill, but we **already** have groundwater
11 contamination. **The** groundwater has **been** impacted
12 so you're going to have a mounding effect up
13 gradient of the landfill **that's** going to push the
14 groundwater through the landfill down gradient of
15 the landfill. You have **I** don't know how many
16 active pumping wells for residential purposes
17 that's going to literally pull -hat stuff down
18 gradient and you're not going to have any barrier
19 control, and that's the number one buzz word of
20 EPA is that you must maintain **control** of your
21 **plume and there is no control of the plume here.**
22 **You can put an 80 foot cap on but you still have**
23 **groundwater contamination and** you're not
24 controlling the **plume. That's all I have.**
25 **MR. KAUFMAN: I have -- I'll tell you.**

Page 102

1 **I think you've raised some very important issues**
2 **that have not been put on the record so I'd like**
3 **to ask you a couple of quick questions as a**
4 hydrogeologist and based **on** your **experience** in
5 doing industry **work interfacing** with EPA on **other**
6 types of **groundwater** related **issues.**

7 Is what you've heard and **observed**
8 here on this site **consistent** with how you've seen
9 EPA handle **other** sites when you are representing
10 industry? Is it similar, different or you don't
11 know yet?

12 **MR. SHALALA:** I don't know yet. I
13 haven't -- like I've said, I've just known about
14 this for -- we just lived here a **year**, and I
15 don't know your dealings with this group or
16 anything. I do know that our historical dealings
17 with the U.S. EPA as well as OEPA, Kentucky,
18 Michigan and so forth, they are much more
19 proactive in protecting the groundwater resources
20 than what I've seen presented here.

21 **MR. KAUFMAN:** In other words, in
22 other states --

23 **MR. SHALALA:** And in Ohio.

24 **MR. KAUFMAN:** -- and in Ohio you've
25 seen more **protection** by the environmental

Page 103

1 agencies than you have here in Uniontown --

2 **MR. SHALALA:** Absolutely.

3 **MR. KAUFMAN:** -- based on your
4 industry experience as a hydrogeologist?

5 **MR. SHALALA:** Absolutely. If you
6 know that there are active water wells in **the**
7 area the agencies will jump all over it. I **mean**,
8 if you're in downtown Detroit and there's no
9 water wells in the area, the downtown Cleveland
10 area, you can get by with it. When you have
11 **known** water wells in a usable aquifer they're
12 jumping all over it.

13 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Second issue, you
14 mentioned microbial studies. Based on your
15 IS experience to come to a conclusion that there is
16 natural **attenuation degrading the contaminants** in
17 the landfii **before** it comes into
18 groundwater, do you recommend doing microbial
19 studies to see if microbes are, in fact, working
20 either aerobically or anaerobically before you
21 **can** draw a conclusion like that?

22 **MR. SHALALA:** Yes, I would recommend
23 **that, that would be a logical --**

24 **MR. KAUFMAN:** And if there are no
25 microbial **studies**, would you as a hydrogeologist

Page 104

1 **have difficulty concluding there is a natural**
2 aerobic or anaerobic **occurrence reducing**
3 **contamination?**

4 **MR. SHALALA:** Yes, I would have a
5 problem with that.

6 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Okay.

7 **MS. FABINSKI:** Could I ask a
8 question?

9 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Yes, ma'am.

10 **MS. FABINSKI:** Could you define what
11 **type** of microbial studies we're talking about?

12 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Any **type** of microbial
13 studies.

14 **MS. FABINSKI:** is **there** something you
15 have in mind? Is there progression of a
16 microbial study?

17 **MR. KAUFMAN:** Any microbial study
18 that demonstrates them **are** microbes present that
19 could, in fact, do aerobic or anaerobic activity
20 to reduce contamination. Am I **correct**, sir,
21 you're **the** hydrogeologist?

22 **MR. SHALALA:** That's correct.

23 **MR. KAUFMAN:** And you haven't seen
24 any in this site?

25 **MR. SHALALA:** Not that I've seen.

1 Again, my limited cursory view of this.

2 MR. KAUFMAN: That's all right. With
3 regards to **the** issue of dissolved oxygen, can
4 dissolved oxygen alone tell you whether there is
5 aerobic or anaerobic activity diminishing
6 contamination from moving in groundwater
7 off-site?

8 MR. SHALALA: No, dissolved oxygen
9 alone cannot do that.

10 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you very
11 much, sir.

12 And **the** final -- wait, is this the
13 final? Nope, two more to go. Peter Spring.
14 Groundwater and spring, that's good. Did I
15 pronounce it **correctly**, sir?

16 MR. SPRING: Yes, you did. Spring,
17 S-P-R-I-N-G, just like the season.

18 I'm a technical adviser for the
19 printing industry, deal a lot **with** chemicals. I
20 don't think I need this. Can everyone hear me?

21 MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, sir.

22 MR. SPRING: Great. I took two weeks
23 off in a job and **went** to Washington, D.C. to
24 spend some time with my nephew who works for **the**
25 EPA. Before that I spoke to him about some

1 cover-up?

2 MR. KAUFMAN: Well, I think once you
3 get the report from the ombudsman you can draw
4 your own conclusions.

5 MR. SPRING: Well, I always have. I
6 worked for the government as a youth during **the**
7 Vietnam War, and I know what the government's
8 capable of, I'm very **aware** of that.

9 I want to make this a little bit more
10 personal, because a lot of you people have been
11 talking about the companies, hi Chris, and about
12 what they've done to us and what has gone on
13 here.

14 I'm here representing my family, my
15 wife's family. I've only lived in Uniontown for
16 three years, I live at 13470 Virginia Avenue,
17 Northwest in -- I have a beautiful home, I've
18 worked very hard to move from Canal **Fulton** to a
19 better area. My wife was born and raised right,
20 right behind us, has **the** next house right next
21 door. Some of you people probably know the
22 **McKitas**. Don **McKita** is probably one of the
23 finest people you could ever meet in your life.

24 I'd like to tell you that my
25 father-in-law, **he** gave me a list of **the** diseases

1 things. He sent me back some **documents** from you
2 folks. The minute. he started looking into it a
3 little bit deeper those things were shut down on
4 him and he was told to mind his own business.

5 MR. KAUFMAN: **Oops**.

6 MR. SPRING: There are some records
7 there that are closed dealing with our dump site
8 and West Valley Test Facilities in New York City,
9 New York state, west New York state dealing with
10 tritium. The tritium is produced in a town at a
11 company in northeastern Ohio. The waste has been
12 trucked there because of their -- which they're
13 doing very well with because I spoke to their
14 safety engineer **there** and had a -- in fact, I
15 drove to Buffalo and spent a couple days with
16 **her**, and she was very shaky about anything I
17 would say here.

18 **These** people -- my nephew says that
19 **he** would be more than glad to give me more
20 information if he can find another job first.

21 That means that this man is afraid of what he's
22 going to say, what he's going to give me.

23 You ask the question of these people
24 that came up here, Do you think **that** there is a
25 cover-up? I'm asking you, do you think there's a

1 **he** has. He has prostate cancer, he has
2 undiagnosed neurological disease that the Mayo
3 Clinic has said that, Well, do you know what,
4 you're one of two, we couldn't tell you what it
5 is. Okay. He has prostate cancer, **he** has
6 cellulitis, he has -- the list goes on. I can't
7 -- it's just terrible.

8 My mother-in-law has breast cancer.
9 My wife, who I've been married to now for ten
10 years, the year before we were married found out
11 **she** had breast cancer, she was 25. We went to
12 the doctors, the doctors took the tumor out of
13 her breast, said. she had **had** that tumor for 11
14 years, 11 years. Where did that tumor come
15 from? Young people getting cancer.

16 I understand **cancer** is the disease of
17 the aging, it's not the **disease** of the children.
18 Mr. Beltz' son passed away. I don't know if
19 you're aware of that, if **you** know the Beltz
20 case. So these things have happened to my
21 family, there's no -- my wife's family. There's
22 no cancer in **the** background, the parents are **all**
23 western Pennsylvania people, lived to be 80, 90.
24 In fact, her grandmother died at 96, strong
25 people, tough people.

Page 109

1 My wife now is fighting cancer
 2 **again**. It has spread to **the** bones, it has spread
 3 to the liver, they found a **spot** in her head the
 4 other day, it's not good.
 5 So I read an article in **the newspaper**
 6 and it talked about the **dump** and some of the
 7 chemicals they had found, and somebody sent me
 8 some information. I got the information from
 9 Chris, I **researched** it, and I started looking at
 10 what they were finding in **the** water and I said,
 11 What are these here? Arsenic, huh. Well, what
 12 does arsenic do? I called a **couple** places to
 13 find out what arsenic does to the human body. It
 14 works on the nervous system and it causes
 15 cancer. It really works on **the** nervous system.
 16 Anything over 60 parts per million,
 17 are you aware of what that does to people? It's
 18 very -- I said to my father-in-law, Do you know
 19 what, you can't walk, you can't -- let's -- I
 20 called his doctor, Will you run a test for him on
 21 arsenic poisoning? Came back 60 parts per
 22 million.
 23 My father-in-law lives over on Judy,
 24 northwest of the dump, 1.2 miles, I know it
 25 because. I walked from the dump over to his house

Page 110

1 with a little rod, cut through yards and
 2 everything, down in **the valley**. Another
 3 gentleman right time, he lives right next door
 4 to us, our neighbor just passed away two months
 5 ago from cancer. Lady down the end of the road
 6 passed away from cancer, the man across the
 7 street has numerous diseases and it's
 8 everywhere. The house I bought, I bought it from
 9 a woman's family who both of them died from
 10 cancer.
 11 So I stopped **the** water from -- my
 12 father-in-law from drinking the water, even
 13 through his osmosis system, that's gone. He will
 14 not -- I called some information up, I find out
 15 that Mr. Beltz had dealt with a woman named
 16 Elaine Panitz and a Dr. Simon. Dr. Panitz deals
 17 with 18 years worth of finding what chemicals do
 18 to people. She said she would be more than glad
 19 to let us know what it is, we sent her some blood
 20 tests. She said she would know more when she did
 21 an autopsy when he passes away, she'll know
 22 exactly.
 23 Dr. Simon told me to move. Dr. Simon
 24 told me that through natural attenuation, that
 25 means **the chemicals** are moving eight feet a day

Page 111

1 away from that dump. This is a man who found
 2 radiation at that dump with a hand-held gauger
 3 counter.
 4 So I go to my family, I tell them all
 5 these things. Well, listen, you know what cancer
 6 does to you financially is phenomenal. We're in
 7 -- we don't want to move. We have no intention
 8 of moving, we've worked our tails off to get what
 9 we have, and we live in a beautiful
 10 neighborhood. Uniontown's a wonderful place to
 11 live. My family all came from Raber Road, so I
 12 know this area.
 13 So that's where we're at with my
 14 family, and that's **the** reason I'm here right now
 15 talking to you about these things hoping that you
 16 have, as I hear on the TV, the cahoonies and
 17 you're not worried about losing your job because
 18 if you come back with something your superiors
 19 don't want to hear, who's to say what **they're**
 20 going to do.
 21 You asked that question about a
 22 cover-up, do I believe the **government**, the EPA,
 23 the most wealthiest organization in **the** United
 24 **States Government**, has covered up something?
 25 This is about **greed**. We're victims, everybody in

Page 112

1 Uniontown is a victim of greed, greed from the
 2 rubber companies, from **the** -- from everybody who
 3 dumped out there.
 4 Sadly to say I remember going out
 5 **there** with my father and dumping garbage, so --
 6 but I wasn't dumping chemicals.
 7 **Let's** see, what other things did I
 8 want to talk about? I believe that my
 9 father-in-law, my wife and her mother picked up
 10 some of these chemicals from the park. My father
 11 has been on the park board since its inception.
 12 The park is where, across the street from the
 13 dump? I mean, if you got a good arm you can
 14 throw a rock. That dump was going on at that
 15 time directly west, it's only logical.
 16 If you go down -- no one's tested the
 17 wells there. I've never heard of anyone saying
 18 the well has been tested. I've been asking
 19 people, Sue Ruley, she didn't know. Any park
 20 board members here? We need water testing within
 21 a five mile radius.
 22 If Dr. Simon is correct, since they
 23 **put** that chemical there, a lake -- and do you
 24 know what, I tried to figure that out and I had
 25 to go to a mathematician, he said, Peter, that

Page 113

Page 114

1 I would be ten square acres ten feet **deep**. You're
2 trying -- you can't convince me that it **hasn't**
3 migrated further than what anyone can possibly
4 imagine. There's big problems here.

5 I can't imagine why we can spend 50
6 million dollars in Washington, D.C. to find out
7 what's going on in Bill Clinton's life and we
8 can't take the time or the money to spend to
9 clean up this dump. I also can't believe that
10 you folks at the EPA. and I'll be at this
11 meeting, have not taken the time to clean this
12 dump up when you scream and yell at these poor
13 little guys who own gas stations to pull those
14 tanks out of the ground at the cost of 20 to
15 \$50,000 but yet you. won't go and clean up **the**
16 dump, it's simple to me.

17 It's just -- do you know what, I've
18 talked to Chris on the. phone a number of times
19 and she's gotten very vocal **with** me. I'm going,
20 Oh, great, I'm going to get to **see** Chris in
21 action, and she was so professional, it's me here
22 just getting livid.

23 I talked to attorneys because of what
24 I believed has happened to my family and they **all**
25 said to me, Peter, what do you want? And I said,

Page 114

Page 115

1 Do you know what, I don't want to sue anybody, I
2 want health issues brought up, I want money put
3 aside for the people's children who get sick.

4 They are building homes south of the
5 dump in mass quantities, and there are people
6 living in there with their children who -- do you
7 know what, here's what I did. I went down there
8 to talk to **them**. I said, Hey, I'm going to buy a
9 brand-new **house**. I drove down there in my
10 Jaguar, looked real good, standing there, I want
11 to buy a new house. Hey, tell me, what about
12 that dump? Oh, that dump's nothing, it's just
13 garbage. They dump garbage in there, don't worry
14 about that, it's no big deal at all.

15 Greed. Greed motivates people. It
16 is a sad, sad situation and again -- gee, I got
17 all these things here. Spoke to that person
18 again at **the** West Valley Test Center and she put
19 me in touch with a gentleman who is a nuclear
20 physicist, and **he** said, Peter, when they take
21 **tritium**, radium, plutonium, whatever, they put it
22 in a drum, they bury it in the ground, they put a
23 whole bunch of chemicals around it, they put dirt
24 around it, and when that drum rots away and those
25 chemicals mix with other chemicals it's an

1 unknown science, they cannot tell you what those
2 chemicals can do. We could really see something
3 grow out of that.

4 How come we can't go look at that
5 dump site when there's snow on it to see where
6 **the** hot spots are where the snow has melted? Did
7 you know that happened? The only reason I know
8 that happened is because of the water tower back
9 there, and being Italian I climbed to the top of
10 the water tower to see what was on the other
11 side, and there was a lot of snow melted on the
12 ground in spots. Now, why is that? Why would
13 that snow melt when **everybody** else's yard is
14 covered with snow?

15 I can say a lot more here, but what
16 I'm going to say, I'm a pit bull, I'm latched on
17 to this, I'm on the Internet, I tell my
18 neighbors, they tell their neighbors, they tell
19 their neighbors. This is not going to stop.
20 This is going to get only bigger and bigger. You
21 can be a hero or you can go back to Montana or
22 wherever it is and say I did my job and pick up
23 your paycheck.

24 You know, in my shop **where** I run we
25 have a little thing **where we'll** run 20,000 sheets

1 of material, and that 20,000 **sheets** of material
2 may get a wrong print on it. The people who ran
3 that print are responsible for that. I have
4 people that will not run bad jobs but if they do,
5 they take the money out of their own pay checks
6 and pay for that job to be fixed, to pay for the
7 materials. We don't let that happen all the time
8 but that does happen when **someone** makes a mistake
9 like that. That's the kind of scruples that
10 these people have. That's the kind of morals
11 that these people have. Look at **them** sitting
12 here, all their hopes and **dreams** are with you,
13 all their families.

14 I don't see one person talk about
15 their families, but you know somebody here has
16 health problems and has family that has health
17 problems and they're not going to bring it up.
18 Well, I am. Every time I hear about this, every
19 time I see something, do you know what, I'm going
20 to get your number **before** I leave **here**, I'm going
21 to get your e-mail address, and I'm going to keep
22 looking and I'm going to keep trying to convince
23 my nephew to give me that information. I'll give
24 him a job.

25 But -- I know there's health board

Page 117

1 people here. I sent my well water somewhere. I
 2 went to Washington, D.C. **and** mailed my water,
 3 shipped my water from Washington, D.C. to Florida
 4 to have it tested because every water people I
 5 called to have tested **they said**, Where you from?
 6 I said, Uniontown, Ohio. They go, Oh, we **know**
 7 what we'll find there. They already knew. They
 8 already knew and they already decided what I **was**
 9 going to send them.

0 This is not good. **We're** not happy
 1 here, we're not going to be happy until you folks
 2 do something, and we don't want to be lied to. I
 3 don't know anyone here who wants to be. lied to,
 4 and do you know what, they won't tell you but
 5 maybe I will, we don't trust **the** government. I
 6 don't trust **them**. I worked for them, I went to
 7 war for them, I know what they can do, I don't
 8 trust **them** and this week **proves** it pretty much,
 9 all that stuff going on in Washington.

0 And do you know what, I think that
 1 I'm pretty much -- said too much. Well, not said
 2 too much but I'm done.

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Just one question,
 4 Peter.

5 MR. SPRING: Yeah, **there** is.

Page 118

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Have you considered
 2 assertiveness training to help you with your
 3 shyness problem?

4 MR. SPRING: Well, I'm not a shy
 5 person, not one bit, and I always voice my
 6 opinion and -- hi, Chris, good to meet **you**.

7 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.
 8 Larry Prince.

9 MR. PRINCE: Hi, I'm Larry Prince, I
 0 live at 247 Rutledge Drive. I used to live at
 1 12559 **Amber** Circle. I boarder on **the** dump. I've
 2 since moved.

3 I want to correct a couple of things
 4 that people weren't aware of. First one that
 5 bothered me was when **they** said the U.S. EPA moved
 6 our houses out and took our houses out of the
 7 toxic waste landfill, yeah, **the** U.S. EPA did it
 8 but **they** didn't do it until **Metzenbaum** held up
 9 **the** entire budget for the entire country until
 0 they gave us the money, that's the only way it
 1 happened, okay.

2 And **the** second thing is about the
 3 barrels, the liquids out there. I lived right
 4 next to **the** dump, I moved out there in '69, and
 5 this has not been going on for 15 years, it's

Page 119

1 been going on for 30 years because I've been
 2 there for 30 years.

3 I walked out to the complex and
 4 talked to people out there, if you want firsthand
 5 information, I saw the football field size pools
 6 of lagoons of chemicals dumped out there, dump
 7 trucks coming in, tanker trucks coming in dumping
 8 fluids in there to soak in the ground on
 9 purpose. Sometimes they brought in barrels and
 10 they dumped them in **the** lagoons and they took **the**
 11 barrels back out and **used** them over again.
 12 And I was in there watching and
 13 talking to the workers, **the** guys that were
 14 dumping it because it wasn't secured, and **they** --
 15 some of the barrels that were taken out, they
 16 were stacked up there, and I asked them, Why are
 17 those barrels there? They said, Well, because we
 18 won't touch those **barrels**.

19 And so there's barrels in there that
 20 have nasty chemicals in them, the people coming
 21 in knew were nasty, and that goes back to the
 22 core samples, back -- the U.S. EPA told us
 23 originally that you don't have to worry about
 24 these chemicals and these barrels because the
 25 life of a barrel in' the ground is seven years and

Page 120

1 it rusts away.

2 Well, when they finally got around to
 3 putting in the pump -- **the** methane gas recovery
 4 system they had to dig down in, and they found
 5 barrels that had been there for 15 years that
 6 were in perfect shape. So you can be sure if you
 7 dig into them you will find barrels that have
 8 whatever **they** have in **them** still haven't leaked
 9 and haven't leaked yet.

10 So you talk about a plume going out,
 11 it is a plume from the chemicals they weren't
 12 afraid of, which was the **benzenes** **they** dumped and
 13 the vinyl chloride from where I used to work at
 14 Aerospace, all the stuff they weren't afraid to
 15 handle but they should have **been**. But the stuff
 16 **they** knew they were afraid of, it stayed in **the**
 17 barrels, it's still in the barrels, and it's not
 18 spread out all over the dump so you can find it.
 19 There's one little spot where they stack **the**
 20 barrels up and they bury them.

21 And that brings into, into -- it
 22 brings **me** into the other problem of why,
 23 **Everybody** wonders why is there a cover-up, how
 24 did this cover-up happen? It's like **the** cop on
 25 all the cop **shows where** they go out **there** and get

Page 121

1 them to fix one ticket and then they got them.

2 It's the same thing **here**.

3 When this thing started I started to
4 fight it because I looked out my back yard and I
5 saw garbage in the dump. Well, they weren't
6 allowed to dump **garbage**. The permit for that
7 place allowed brick, rubble, wood and latex
8 liquids and I see garbage back there. So I go
9 and I talk to the zoning inspector, and the
10 zoning inspector, we're talking just a little guy
11 now, a guy by the name of Harold Parr, he's dead,
12 God rest his soul, would deny **there** was ever any
13 garbage in that dump, yet he would go up there
14 every day, drink a cup of coffee and watch the
15 garbage trucks go by, okay.

6 And then when we were down there
7 trying to fight Hyman **Budoff**, which was the owner
8 of Hybud which ran that place, we were trying to
9 stop the garbage from coming in and we complained
10 about this great odor of sulfur dioxide or rotten
11 eggs smell coming in, and he's sitting there at
12 **this meeting in the township hall and he said,**
13 Well, that only happened once, that happened once
14 **when one of our bulldozers ran over one of our**
15 **drums of chemicals, one of the chemical drums.** I

Page 122

1 leapt up and said, Chemical drums, you're not
2 allowed to dump chemicals **there**, and I at that
3 point tried to raise a holy ruckus but nobody
4 cared.

5 Our Zoning Board of Appeals was made
6 up of a bunch of farmers who thought it was good
7 to live next door to a portable cement plant
8 because they got free lime on their land, so
9 nobody did anything. I tried to get them to stop
10 dumping liquids.

1 I got the runaround from the Stark
2 County Board of Health, okay, because when I
3 tried to go there to present the problems, these
4 guys are dumping chemicals with all these water
5 wells around, they would purposely move the Stark
6 County Board of Health meeting so we would show
7 up for a meeting and **they** weren't there. Finally
8 after three meetings somebody called us and said
9 the next meeting is unannounced and it's here.
10 We showed up, they gave an order to stop dumping
11 chemicals. Unfortunately it didn't stop for
12 three more years, at least they gave an order.
13 The's the cover-up. The cover-up started
14 there.. The health department was covering up.
15 I talked to a guy who was in charge

Page 123

1 of landfills for Stark County, he was not
2 concerned **about** what was going into our dump. He
3 wanted to keep Stark out -- the **IEL open** because
4 he had no place to put garbage in Stark County,
5 that's all he cared about. He told me, and I
6 believe he's in the audience today, he told me
7 that all's he cared about was **where** the garbage
8 was going to go.

9 So they came back and here was this
10 man that had been violating all sorts of rules
11 and they gave him an additional permit to dump
12 garbage, yet when we called the Ohio E -- the
13 Stark County Health Department and asked if there
14 was problems with the water supply, if **there** was
15 any chemicals going into **the** dump, they knew
16 that, there was internal memos, they knew it was
17 going in there, but if you called them they
18 denied it.

9 So once they're in there we have --
10 the guy who was on the Ohio EPA went to work for
11 the tire and rubber companies, and you wonder
12 what kind of advice and **help** is **he** giving us if
13 he goes and works for the rubber company the next
14 week. We-you--oncedthey-oncewecstart
15 accusing them of covering up, of lying to us,

Page 124

1 it's like a wolverine, although I hate to **mention**
2 the guys being a Buckeye fan, they back up in a
3 corner and **they're** defending themselves.

4 And I think it's just one **lie** after
5 another builds up onto another lie that it became
6 an antagonistic thing, **Chris** Borello's group,
7 myself, **more** Chris than me because she's a much
8 smarter lady than I am, but it become an
9 antagonistic atmosphere where it was more like,
10 I'll be damned if I'll do a thing for you, you
11 know, and it was just **like** -- we don't care about
12 -- it's a -- it's a pissing match between
13 different people, excuse **my** French, but that's
14 what it turned into, and that's how a cover-up
15 came around.

6 You talk about other sites like that,
7 I think this evolved because it started at such a
8 low level, it went **through** every stinking
9 organization that we dealt with, we got
10 stonewalled, you know, from **the** Stark County
11 Health Department to the Ohio EPA to the U.S.
12 EPA. We kept catching them in lies and they'd
13 back up to cover **themselves** up. So that's how it
14 happened and that's why no one here trusts
15 anybody, because we've never been **dealt** with

Page 125

1 straight.
2 And if you ask me if there's a
3 cover-up, I have no doubt in my mind there's a
4 cover-up at all levels of the government, and it
5 is about money as ~~the~~ last person said, it is
6 about money because at the ~~first~~ place it was
7 money for a place -- ~~because~~ the tire and rubber
8 companies, they wanted a place close to their
9 dumps because they figured the cost per mile of
0 dumping that trash and we ~~were~~ the **closest place**
1 **so they** brought it here, and that's all I got to
2 say.

3 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, sir. Joe
4 Mosyjowski.

5 MR. MOSYJOWSKI: ~~Used to be Smith~~, I
6 had it changed. My name's **Joe Mosyjowski**, 2615
7 **Swartz Road**. I'll try to be **very** brief, I know
8 it's been a long evening. I'll just try to use a
9 little simple logic here.

0 The EPA **is** a **regulatory** agency Of the
1 federal government **as** everyone's aware. It's
2 funded by ~~the~~ tax paying citizens -- partially
3 **funded at least by the tax paying citizens many**
4 of **which are** in this room. Unfortunately to date
5 **that has been its only real connection with the**

Page 126

1 concerns of these same **citizens**.
2 Now, we've heard a lot of talk over
3 the years about erosions of our freedoms bit by
4 bit. **The time has come after all these years to**
5 take back our government and our **freedoms** person
6 by **person**. The time has come to fully disclose
7 and identify all the pollutants at **IEL**. It's
8 time to quantify them and **then** it's time to
9 remove them. It's time, in effect, to protect
0 these citizens of Uniontown, they deserve it.

1 So, Mr. Martin, and, Mr. Kaufman,
2 we're asking you to please represent ~~these~~ good
3 people of Uniontown, please go to bat for them
4 and please help **them** get to the bottom of **this**
5 mess. Thank you very much.

6 MR. KAUFMAN: Thanks. Finally, Mark
7 Nixon.

8 MR. NIXON: My name is Mark Nixon. I
9 live at 10524 **Newbury** Avenue, Northwest. I have
0 only lived in the Uniontown area less than three
1 years.

2 **When we were** looking at a brand-new
3 home we were **concerned** about things we had heard
4 about **IEL**, and so we did some research, got some
5 EPA reports off ~~the~~ Internet, information like

Page 127

1 that, which told us at the time that all of the
2 ~~concern~~ about pollution from the **IEL** landfill was
3 to the north and northwest of the landfill. **The**
4 house we purchased at the time was an existing
5 home, been there about 20 years south of the
6 landfill, we felt that was a safe place.

7 Since that time we have read reports
8 and got information that tells us that actually
9 **the** groundwater flows in all **directions** from that
10 point. The report we got that said everything
11 **was** going north and northwest was an EPA report.

12 Do you ask do I think there's a
13 cover-up? How can there not be.

14 MR. KAUFMAN: Before Bob Martin gives
15 some -- a closing perspective on the next steps,
16 again, Denise Gawlinski from our Region **5** office
17 was **here** all night to listen to your concerns
18 also in ~~the~~ audience, and I know she wanted to
19 make a comment about the hearing coming up in
20 March, I believe, Denise?

21 MS. GAWLINSKI: **Yes. Thank you. I**
22 know you mentioned it in the beginning, but I
23 wanted to take a minute to reintroduce myself.
24 My name **is Denise Gawlinski**, I'm U.S. based
25 **community** involvement **at** neighboring sites, and

Page 128

1 **as Mr. Kaufman** here I was listening to your
2 concerns that you shared with our national
3 ombudsman, and I will bring those back to my
4 technical team back in Chicago.

5 And I would also like to mention that
6 Patrick Galloway from Ohio EPA is here **as well**,
7 and he's serving in a similar capacity.

8 I just wanted to mention again that
9 U.S. EPA is holding its public meeting on the
10 proposed plan on Tuesday, March **2nd**. And this
11 **was** just confirmed on Friday, we just mentioned
12 this on Friday, so I quickly printed up a flyer,
13 which is at the front of ~~the~~ room. But we will
14 **be** doing a Separate mailing to everyone on our
15 mailing list so you will be notified directly of
16 the meeting, and of course we'll be placing ads
17 in both the Canton Repository and Beacon Journal
18 announcing it as well.

19 If you all received our fax a few
20 weeks ago, which spelled out **the new** proposal,
21 that means you're on our mailing list and you'll
22 get additional information. If there's someone
23 ~~here~~ that didn't **receive** it by mail, please see
24 **me after and I'll be sure you are put on our**
25 mailing list. Thanks.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. I would just
2 like to thank everybody who came forward. We
3 have a Court Reporter, obviously I'm going to
4 have a number of copies of this made. And I
5 found this to be, and I'm going to enjoy reading
6 it, one of the more detailed and comprehensive
7 hearings where substantive information has been
8 put on the record, and I think it will go a long
9 way in helping Bob's job in looking at everything
10 that has been done and will be done.

1 And so without further ado, I'd like
2 to reintroduce, since he introduced me, Bob
3 Martin, EPA's national ombudsman for some closing
4 remarks.

5 MR. MARTIN: I have no prepared
6 statement, okay. I wanted to come and see and I
7 have. I thought that was very important before I
8 make any final judgments about the kind of
9 preliminary recommendations I will be making to
10 our management officials in the Chicago Region 5
11 office and in Washington, DC. as well and EPA.

12 Thank you for sharing your lives with
13 me and for speaking from your hearts about your
14 experiences here in Uniontown living next to this
15 toxic waste site. I was very moved by what all

1 of you had to say. It means a great deal to me
2 to have been here tonight with you to have 'shared
3 this with you.

4 I don't live in Montana, I live just
5 outside of Washington, D.C. I don't know, I
6 haven't read yet the newspaper accounts which
7 have described me or what I've done or who I am.
8 I will do my job, okay, and that job is to help
9 protect human health and the environment, not
10 only here but in every community in which we have
11 a responsibility to do that throughout the United
12 States. I believe that will be done by EPA, by
13 ATSDR and by the State of Ohio.

4 My preliminary recommendations will
5 be made very soon, okay. As I said, it was
6 important for me to get here first, and thank you
7 for, having me. Good night.

8
9 (Hearing concluded at 10: 15 o'clock p.m.)
10 - - -

1
2 CERTIFICATE
3 STATE OF OHIO,) ss:
4 SUMMIT COUNTY,)
5 I, Cynthia Holderbaum, and RPR and
6 Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio,
7 duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby
8 certify that the proceedings were by me reduced
9 to Stenotypy, afterwards transcribed upon a
10 computer; and that the foregoing is a true and
11 correct transcription of the proceedings so given
12 as aforesaid.

13 I do further certify that these
14 proceedings were taken at the time and place in
15 the foregoing caption specified, and were
16 completed without adjournment.

17 I do further certify that I am not a
18 relative, counsel or attorney of any party, or
19 otherwise interested in the event of this action.

20 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
21 set my hand and affixed my seal of office at
22 Akron, Ohio, on this 2nd day of February, 1999.

13 Cynthia Holderbaum
14 Cynthia Holderbaum, RPR and Notary
15 Public in and for the State of Ohio.